

9th December 1952]

[Mr. Speaker]

motion to me and I explained to them that a similar motion was ruled out last time and that a motion which had been ruled out could not be brought again in a different language. If for argument's sake it is conceded that this is a different motion, the present motion reads: 'The grave situation caused by the failure of the Government to take effective steps . . .'. I have already told the House that this is a matter to be dealt with by the Centre. But I respect the feeling and honesty of the hon. Member, Sri T. Nagi Reddi, because he told me that he brought forward this motion as he honestly felt that this Government were responsible for the failure in not giving an Andhra Province and not for staging a walk-out. However, as I have already explained fully, I rule this adjournment motion out of order."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—"On a point of personal explanation, Sir. When we discussed the question of this adjournment motion with you, we certainly told you about our attitude when you asked us, 'Is this adjournment motion for staging a walk-out?'; we mean no disrespect to the Chair or to the ruling given by the Chair. But some of us very strongly feel that the Government of Madras could have done something. I am not questioning the ruling given by you, Sir. But I just want to say, as a mark of protest against the attitude of the Government, some of us will walk out of this House for a few minutes."

Then, some Members led by Sri P. Ramamurthi walked out of the House.

III.—MESSAGE FROM THE COUNCIL.

MR. SPEAKER :—"I have to announce to the House that I have received the following message, dated the 9th December 1952, from the Hon. the Chairman, Madras Legislative Council :—

'I transmit a copy of the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 12 of 1952), as agreed to by the Council without any amendment and signed by me.'"

IV.—GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE MADRAS MOTOR VEHICLES (TAXATION OF PASSENGERS AND GOODS) BILL, 1952—*cont.*

Clause 3—cont.

MR. SPEAKER :—"We shall now resume the discussion on clause 3 of the Bill."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"May I submit, Sir, that in a similar case in 1925, if I remember correct, when about 44 Members of the then Swaraj Party walked out of the Central Assembly, the then President, Sri Vithalbhai Patel, said that he would not proceed further with the business of the House when a good number

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [9th December 1952]

of Members had walked out. So, may I request you, Sir, to allow amendments to be moved after the Members who have walked out, return? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" No, it is not possible."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" This is a slavish imitation, Sir. Because there was a walk-out in Delhi must they also walk out here? Because somebody delayed the proceedings, must we wait for the 'walked-out' gentlemen to come back? All this is very wrong, Sir."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I must protest against the word 'slavish' used by the Hon. Chief Minister.

" Sir, I want to say a few words respecting clause 3. In spite of the best and most persuasive attempts made to make the Government change their adamant attitude against the bus operators, the Government have not seen their way to reduce the rate of taxation. Amendments were suggested that the rate might be reduced to three pies or six pies if three pies was not acceptable and this would have helped the bus operators a great deal. As I submitted already, Sir, quite a number of accounts of the operators had been perused and I read out the accounts of an operator and showed how they were not in a position even to pay nine pies in the rupee. I would ask the Hon. the Chief Minister, the Hon. Finance Minister and the Hon. Transport Minister that they might give due consideration to this aspect when the Bill goes to the Council and reduce the rate to six pies in the rupee. The Hon. Finance Minister said that they would get about Rs. 1.20 crores by means of this Bill. If they reduce the rate to six pies in the rupee, they would not lose more than Rs. 20 or Rs. 30 lakhs and they would still get a substantial amount of Rs. 1 crore. I would request the Hon. Finance Minister to be satisfied with Rs. 1 crore under this Bill by reducing the rate to six pies in the rupee. The amount of Rs. 1 crore is not a small amount, Mr. Speaker, when they are at present collecting about Rs. 3.87 crores budgeted under this head. If as an addition they get about Rs. 1 crore more, it would be a 20 per cent enhancement over the present collection and so the Government must be satisfied with this 20 per cent increase over the existing collections. I, therefore, appeal to the Government that they must reconsider the position when the Bill goes to the Council and reduce the rate to six pies in the rupee."

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" I do not agree with the suggestion, Sir."

Clause 3, as amended, was put and carried.

Clause 4.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move—

'Omit sub-clause (2) and the figure "1" and the brackets in sub-clause (1).

9th December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

“ For the words “ *approved by* ”, substitute the words “ *previously approved by a resolution of* ”.”

Sir, sub-clause (2) reads : “ The schedule may, from time to time, be amended by rules made by the Government and approved by the Legislative Assembly of the State.” Now I am suggesting that the rules may be previously approved by a resolution by the Legislative Assembly of the State.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Sir, this amendment is not necessary. The sub-clause, as it is, is all right.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I may submit, Sir, that at the time when this particular clause was inserted, I would request the Hon. Finance Minister to remember, the Select Committee had no idea that the Government would introduce clause 16 ‘ power to make rules ’. We were not aware that a proviso had been added here. All rules under clause 16 have to be placed for approval on the table of the House. Therefore, it will be quite right if they omit this.”

3-10
p.m.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Sir, it is all right as it is.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ I am not pressing the amendment, Sir.”

The amendment was, by leave of the House, withdrawn.
Clause 4 was put and carried.

Clause 5.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Sir, I move—

‘ For the words “ *daily or at such other* ”, occurring in the last line, substitute the words “ *monthly or at such longer* ”.’

It is a very simple amendment. Under this clause, the operators are required to submit daily returns. Instead of having to submit daily returns which will be an inconvenience to all people concerned, I would make them submit monthly returns. Check-ups are always there and unnecessary expenditure also will be avoided. We shall try to put them to the least inconvenience—that is the purpose of this amendment.”

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY :—“ I second this amendment; it is a very modest amendment, Sir.”

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ Sir, while supporting this amendment, I would like the Government to note these facts. They have asked the bus-operators to submit their statements every day. What happens when I sit in a bus which carries me from Madras to some other place? The driver stops at the police station on the mere pretext that he should get into the police station and sign the

[Sri K. Vinayakam] [9th December 1952]

register maintained there. What will happen if there is to be another station where he has to submit his statement? There also he will have to stop. Surely, it will be duplication of work. We know that, after the introduction of the sales tax in our State, merchants are submitting accounts. Even though transactions are carried on in a business concern every day, the business people do not submit accounts every day to the Commercial Tax Officer. They only submit monthly returns and we find it in practice that they are not in a position to cheat Government. Where then is the necessity or the reason for submitting statements of account daily, I want to know. It will only be penalising the public, inconveniencing the operator and duplicating the work of the Government officers, and it will make the officers go through a long process of work. In order to avoid the waste of their time and energy, I submit that this amendment may be accepted."

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Sir, the public will not be inconvenienced; our officers also will not mind looking into the accounts. I feel, Sir, these daily returns are absolutely necessary."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" It is not a question of the officers being inconvenienced, Sir. It is a question of the people who have to pay the tax being forced to submit returns every day; it is not a thing heard of in connection with any other tax."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" There is all the difference in the world between a day-book and a ledger. If anybody is asked to send account once a month, there is plenty of room for manipulation. This is the daily ledger in this case and if they are asked to send daily accounts, nobody need look into them, because each day it is sent up. It is a healthy rule."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" It will not be a healthy rule for the bus operators."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I now put Mr. Ramamurthi's amendment to the vote of the House. The question is—

'For the words "daily or at such other" occurring in the last line, *substitute* the words "monthly or at such longer".'

The amendment was lost.

Clause 5 was put and carried.

Clause 6.

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" If you will permit me, Sir, I want to move an amendment now. I would like to *delete* the words '10th day' in line 5 and *substitute* the words '15th day'. It has been brought to the notice of the Government that most operators pay salaries to their employees on the 7th of each month, and to ask them to pay again to the Government on the 10th will be a difficulty.

9th December 1952] [Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

“ So, I move—

‘ In line 5, for the words “ tenth day ” substitute the words
“ fifteenth day ”.’ ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ In line 5, for the words “ tenth day ” substitute the words
“ fifteenth day ”.’ ”

The amendment was carried.

Clause 6 as amended was put and carried.

Clause 7.

Clause 7 was put and carried.

Clause 8.

Clause 8 was put and carried.

Clause 9.

Clause 9 was put and carried.

Clause 10.

Clause 10 was put and carried.

Clause 11.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Sir, I move—

‘ In sub-clause (a), for the word “ seven ”, substitute the
word “ fifteen ”.’ ”

“ My amendment only seeks to raise the time-limit within which
the bus operator has to pay the tax or the penalty from seven days
to fifteen days, so that he may not be put to much loss. It is a very
simple amendment.”

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY :—“ I second the amendment.”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ I accept the amend-
ment, Sir.”

The amendment was carried.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ My next amendment is this :

‘ For the existing sub-clause (b), substitute the following :—

“ (b) in case the returns required by section 5 have not
been submitted for more than fifteen days after the
time prescribed under section 5.” ’

“ It is only consequential to the amendment just now accepted
by the Government.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ No, Sir; it is
not consequential. It is an addition to the delay.”

[9th December 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ This sub-clause refers to the submission of returns within seven days. Mr. Ramamurthi's amendment is not consequential, Sir.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ I am not pressing the amendment.”

The amendment was, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

Clause 11, as amended, was put and carried.

Clause 12.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Sir, I move—

‘ For the existing sub-clause (2), substitute the following :—

“(2) The Transport Commissioner after giving the appellant an opportunity of being heard, pass such orders on the appeal as he thinks fit and the Transport Commissioner shall have power during the pendency of the appeal to stay the operation of the order appealed against.”

“ The original sub-clause (2) is—

‘ The Transport Commissioner or any officer authorized by him may, after giving the appellant an opportunity of being heard, pass such orders on the appeal as he thinks fit.’

“ My amendment simply seeks to make it clear that stay of proceedings must be allowed. It is a very simple amendment, Sir.”

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY :—“ I second it.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ In the case of taxes, generally, there is always a rule that the amount due should be paid if an appeal is to be admitted. Much more, therefore, is it necessary here in regard to these fleeting transactions where they fly about and accounts have to be sent, that the amount should be paid and the appeal heard. There is nothing wrong in that.”

The amendment was, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

Clause 12 was put and carried.

Clause 13.

Clause 13 was put and carried.

Clause 14.

Clause 14 was put and carried.

Clause 15.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member, Sri V. Sri Krishna has given notice of an amendment to omit the clause. I wish to

9th December 1952] [Mr. Speaker]

inform him that amendments to omit the clause will not be allowed. If the hon. Member wants, he can speak against the clause or vote against it."

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Sir, I move—

'In clause 15, for the words "one thousand", substitute the words "two hundred and fifty".'

"The reason for the amendment is that the monthly tax of a bus comes to Rs. 180 and the penalty therefor should be less than double that amount. Since thousand rupees is in excess of it, we are prepared to reduce it to Rs. 250."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" I want to know, Sir, whether for the words 'one thousand', wherever they occur, the words 'two hundred and fifty' would be substituted? "

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Only in this clause, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

'In clause 15, for the words "one thousand", substitute the words "two hundred and fifty".'

The amendment was carried.

* SRI V. SRI KRISHNA :—" అధ్యక్షా, నేను యీ బిల్లులోని 15 వ క్లాజును oppose చేస్తూ పూర్తిగా omit చేయాలని అంటున్నాను. విలసనగా యీ క్లాజులో 'or is reasonably suspected of having committed' అనిన్నీ 'a sum of money not exceeding one thousand rupees or double the amount of tax payable whichever is greater in addition to the tax recoverable' అనిన్నీ ఉపహరించివచ్చింది. ఈ విషయములు రెండన్నూ ఒప్పు ఆపరేటర్లనున్నా లారీ ఆపరేటర్లనున్నా చాలా యిబ్బందులకు గరిచేస్తున్నాయి. అందులో వెస్ట్యా విషయములో ప్రభుత్వమే సవరణ తెచ్చింది కాబట్టి కొంతవరకూ నా ఉద్దేశ్యం నెరవేరింది. పాథారణంగా ఎక్కువ డబ్బుగలవారుగా ఉండే ఆపరేటర్లు యీ penalties కు తట్టుకోగలరు. చిన్న ఆపరేటర్లు మాత్రం యీ penalties ను కట్టుకోలేక వాళ్లకున్న బస్సులుగాని, లారీలుగాని, అక్సుకోవలసిన పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడు తాయి. ఇట్టి స్థితులు ఏర్పడడమువల్ల కుటుంబాలు కూలిపోవడముతప్ప మరేమి కన బడదు. అందువల్ల *for the words "one thousand rupees" substitute the words "two hundred and fifty rupees"* అని చెబితే చాగుంటుంది."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The Hon. Minister himself has moved that."

* SRI V. SRI KRISHNA :—" ఈ offence ను రుజువుచేయకుండానే డబ్బు గుంజేందుకు, యిబ్బందులు వెళ్లేందుకు అఫీసర్లకు చాలా scope యిస్తుంది. ఇంతకు ముందే బిల్లులోని 6, 7 క్లాజులలోకూడా ప్రభుత్వం మార్పులు చేసింది. అందుకని యీ క్లాజును పూర్తిగా omit చేయమని కోరుతున్నాను. లేదా, 'reasonably suspected of having committed' అనే మాటలు అయినను యీ క్లాజులోనుంచి తొలగించి వేస్తే నాకేమి అభ్యంతరము ఉండదు."

[9th December 1952]

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ I oppose the amendment, Sir.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ He is opposing the clause itself.”

Clause 15, as amended, was put and carried.

Clause 16 was put and carried.

Clause 17.

* SRI V. SRI KRISHNA :—“ అధ్యక్ష, బిల్లులోని 17 వ క్లాజును నేను amendment తెచ్చాను.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ As I have already stated, amendments to ‘ Omit the clause ’, need not be moved, but hon. Members may speak against the clause.”

* SRI V. SRI KRISHNA :—“ అధ్యక్ష, ఈ బిల్లులోని 17 వ క్లాజును omit చేయుమని కోరుతున్నాను. విలసనగా యీ క్లాజు బన్ను ఆపరేటర్లను, లారీ ఆపరేటర్లను ఆఫీసర్లు అనవసరంగా కోర్టుకు లాగటానికి తోడ్పడుతుంది. ఈ క్లాజు bus operators మీదగాని, lorry operators మీదకాని ఆఫీసర్లకు ఎక్కువగా అధికారం చెలాయించి, నిజా నిజాలు తెలుసుకోకుండా అనేక ఇబ్బందులకు గురిచేయటానికి scope యిస్తుంది. ఈ ఆపరేటర్లు అనేక కష్టాలకు లోను కావలసి వస్తుంది. ఈ క్లాజులో గవర్న మెంటు permission లేనిది గవర్న మెంటు ప్రతినిధుల మీద criminal proceedings తీసుకో మాడను అని వుంది. దీని వల్ల ప్రతి గవర్న మెంటు ప్రతినిధిని ఈ ఆపరేటర్ల మీద అధికారం చెలాయించుతారు. అందువల్ల అటువంటి scope ఈ ప్రతినిధులకు యివ్వకుండా ఉంటే, అనవసరపు అధికారం ఈ ఆపరేటర్ల మీద చెలాయించుటకు వీలు వుండును. అందుకనే ఈ క్లాజు వద్దని అంటున్నాను. ప్రభుత్వ ప్రతినిధి తప్పుచేస్తే వారిమీద ఏమి action లేకుండా ప్రభుత్వం కాపాడు తున్నది. ఈ ఆపరేటర్ల మీద offences రుజువు అయినా కాక పోయినా, నుండు వీరిని criminal courts కు యీడ్చేటందుకు సావకాశం వుంది. ఒక వేళ రుజువు కాకపోతే, suspect చేసి కేసు పెట్టాము అంటారు. గనుక యిటువంటి అనవసర ఆవకాశాలు ప్రభుత్వ ప్రతినిధులకు యివ్వకుండా ప్రభుత్వం చూడాలి. ఈ కారణాలవల్ల ఈ క్లాజును పూర్తిగా omit చేయమని కోరుతున్నాను.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ అధ్యక్ష, ఈ బిల్లు లోని 17 వ క్లాజును నేను వ్యతిరేకించుచున్నాను. ఎందుకంటే, ఈ క్లాజువల్ల గవర్న మెంటు ఉద్యోగస్తులు ఏమి తప్పుచేసినను, ఎన్ని అక్రమాలు చేసినను, ఏలాంటి అన్యాయాలు చేసినప్పటికీ, ఈ ఉద్యోగస్తుల మీద కోర్టులో ఏలాంటి వ్యాజ్యాలు వేయటానికి వీలు లేకుండా ఈ క్లాజును తీసుకొని రాబడింది. ఎవరికైనా అన్యాయాలు, అక్రమాలు జరిగితే కోర్టులో న్యాయం జరిగే ఉపకారము కోరుతారు. అటు వంటిది ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులయితే అన్యాయాలు చేసినను, న్యాయం అని చెప్పటానికి, ఆపరేటర్లు న్యాయంగా ప్రవర్తించినను, ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులు ఎదో మిషన్ పెట్టుకొని, అన్యాయపు కేసుపెట్టితే, శిక్షించ చేయటానికి, ప్రభుత్వము ఈ క్లాజు చేర్చింది. ప్రభుత్వ ఉద్యోగస్తులు చేసేది అంతయు న్యాయమంటారు. ఆపరేటర్లు చేసేది న్యాయమైనను అన్యాయమే అంటారు. ఇదికాకుండా ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులు అక్ర

9th December 1952] [Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu]

మాలు చేస్తే, వారిపైన కేసు పెట్టితే కోర్టులో హాజరు కావటానికి ప్రభుత్వం ముందుగా permission యిస్తేనే గాని వారిపైన కేసు పెట్టటానికి వీలుండదు. ఇటు వంటి protection ఈ ఉద్యోగస్తులకు ఇవ్వటానికి ప్రభుత్వం ఈ క్లాజు పెట్టింది. అనేకమంది పోలీసు ఉద్యోగస్తులు ఎన్నో ఆత్మశాసనాలు చేసినా, ఎన్నో అక్రమాలు చేసినా, వారిపైన కేసు పెట్టవలసి వచ్చినట్లయితే గవర్నమెంటు previous sanction కావలసివుంది. ఒక వేళ ఈ ఉద్యోగస్తుల మీద కోర్టులో కేసు రుజువు అయితే శిక్ష వేస్తారేమో అని భయంతో ఈ protective clause లేబడింది. ప్రజాస్వామ్య విధానంలో స్వతంత్రము కావాలని కోరుతున్నప్పుడు, ఈ క్లాజు ఉపయోగ మేమని అడుగుతున్నాను. ఇది democracy అనిపించుకోదు. ఇదివరకు బ్రిటిషువారి హయాములోనూడా యీ మాదిరి provision ఉంటూవచ్చింది. వారు ఆ కాలములో ఆ మాదిరి system పెట్టుకొన్నారంటే, వాళ్లలో ఆనాడు District Officers గాను, వాళ్లదేశాల important places లో వాళ్ల జాతివారు ఉన్నందున వాళ్లకు protection కొరకు అటువంటి provision పెట్టుకొన్నారు. అదే provision స్వతంత్రరాజ్యము అని చెప్పుకునే యీ క్రాంగ్రెసు గవర్నమెంటునూడా ఆ provision renew చేస్తున్నారు. ఈ క్లాజు వంటి ప్రజలకు స్వతంత్ర మనేది ఎక్కడవుందని అడుగు తున్నాను. ఈ క్లాజువల్ల బహు అపరేటర్లమీదను, లారీ అపరేటర్లమీదను, ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులు నిర్ణయగా అన్యాయపు కేసులుపెట్టి కోర్టులకు లాగే స్వతంత్రము యిస్తుంది. ఈ క్రాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వము ఇంకను బ్రిటిషువారి సాంప్రదాయాలనే అనుసరించుచున్నారు. దీనినిబట్టి చూడగా బ్రిటిషువారు నిరంతర ప్రభుత్వ విధానము వలనడిపించారో, అదేవిధముగా శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు కూడా నిరంతర విధానము పెట్టాలనే ఉద్దేశ్యము కనబడుచున్నది. అందువల్లనే యీ క్లాజును omit చేయమంటే వారు అంగీకరించజాలమని అంటున్నారు. ఆ నాడు బ్రిటిషువారున్నప్పుడు High Judicial Officials గాని, తదితర పెద్ద ఉద్యోగస్తులకొరకు వారికి ఆ విధమైన provi- sion కావలసివచ్చింది గనుక పెట్టుకొన్నారు. ఈ నాడునూడా అదేవిధంగా ప్రభుత్వపు నడక కన్పించుచున్నది. అందువల్లనే ఈ క్లాజు లేబడిందని స్పష్టమవు చున్నది. ఈ క్లాజు యీ అపరేటర్లకు అన్యాయం జరగటానికి దోహదమిస్తుంది గనుకనున్నా, democratic విధానానికి వ్యతిరేకము గనుకనున్నా యీ క్లాజును omit చేయవలసిందిగా కోరుచున్నాను.”

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“ అధ్యక్షా, ఈ బిల్లులోని 17 వ క్లాజును పూర్తిగా తీసివేయాలని ప్రతిపాదించబడినటువంటి ఆ సవరణను నేను అవసరమ చున్నాను. దీనికి రెండు కారణాలున్నవి. మొదటిది ఏమిటంటే, ప్రభుత్వము జారీ చేసేటటువంటి ఉత్తరవులు తన officers ద్వారా పనులు జరిపిస్తుంటుంది. ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులను రక్షించుకొనుటకొరకై యీ క్లాజును ప్రవేశ పెట్టింది. ఈ క్లాజువల్ల ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులు బహు అపరేటర్ల మీదను, లారీ అపరేటర్ల మీదను అధికారం చలాయించుటకు వీలు కలుగజేసేటటువంటి క్లాజు అని చెప్పబడుచున్నది. అంతేకాకుండా ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులు యీ అపరేటర్ల మీద అన్యాయపు కేసులుపెట్టి, అక్రమంగా కోర్టుకులాగ కష్టాలుకు గురిచేసేటటువంటి క్లాజు అయియున్నది. అపరేటర్లు తప్పు నిజముగా చేయకపోయినను, అధికారము, అజమాన్య అధికారమున్నందున, యీ ఉద్యోగులకు అనేక విధాలుగా వీలు కలుగచేస్తుంది. అపరేటర్లు తప్పుచేస్తే శిక్షించుటకున్నా, ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులు తప్పుచేసినను రక్షించుటకున్నా యీ క్లాజు పూర్తిగా సాహకారము యిస్తుంది. ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులు అపరేటర్లమీద కేసులు పెట్టడానికి

3-30
p.m.

[Sri D. Seetharamiah]

[9th December 1952]

యీ క్లాజు ప్రవచించిస్తుందిగాని, ఆపరేటర్లు యీ ఆఫీసర్లను కేసులు పెట్టుటకు వీలుండదు. ఒకవేళ యీ ఉద్యోగస్తులు తప్పు చేసినప్పుడు కేసు పెట్టాలంటే, గవర్నమెంటుదగ్గరనుంచి ముందుగా పర్మిషన్ తీసుకోవాలని ఉంది. పర్మిషనుకు ఆఫీసర్ ప్రభుత్వవారు అట్టిది యివ్వక సహకరిస్తారు. అధికారము చేతిలో ఉన్నదనే మిషన్ ఆపరేటర్లను ఆక్రమ అధికారం యీ ఉద్యోగస్తులు చలాయించుకు యీ క్లాజు సహాయము చేస్తుంది. గనుక ఉద్యోగులకు ఎలాంటి హక్కు యీ క్లాజువల్ల కలుగుతున్నదో, అలాగే యీ ఆపరేటర్లకు ప్రజలనుగూడా అధికారముండ వలెను. కాని అటువంటిదిలేదు. సామాన్య ప్రజానీకమైన యీ ఆపరేటర్లు యీ క్లాజులో సూచించబడ్డ penalty యీ, ఉద్యోగస్తులకు లాంగివాలని వచ్చింది. ఈ క్లాజులో సూచించబడ్డ విధానము సరియైనదికాదు. ఆపరేటర్లకు అన్యాయం జరిగిందంటే ఉద్యోగస్తులను కేసు పెట్టాలంటే పర్మిషన్ కొరకు ప్రభుత్వాన్ని అనుసరించాలి. అది అంత తేలికైనదికాదు. ఇలాంటి పరిస్థితులలో యీ ఆపరేటర్లు యిబ్బందులకు అన్యాయముగా గురి కావలసివస్తుంది గనుక, యీ క్లాజును omit చేయమని కోరుతున్నాను. అందువల్ల యీ క్లాజుకుగాను తప్పని సరిని 20 వరుస్తున్నాను."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Sir, while supporting the deletion of this clause absolutely from this Bill, I wish to bring to the notice of the Government the following facts. To enforce this Act, the Government will need the assistance of prescribed officers or police officials. I am not one who is against police officials. They are the guardians of peace, and if they discharge their duty properly they are quite welcome in our State. But from actual experience we find and I say this without fear of contradiction that in the mufassal police officials have been using their power of control over buses as a lever in their hand to terrorize bus operators, cause great inconvenience to passengers, and do all the rest of it which I am not prepared to disclose here. I am one with the Government that no proceedings should be instituted against any Government official for any steps taken in the discharge of his duty. But there should be a provision to enable the institution of criminal proceedings against officials who are guilty of using their powers beyond a reasonable limit. Officials who commit mistakes must be brought to book. It will be difficult for the bus operators to prove to the Government the misbehaviour of police officials. Past experience shows that the Government have given their consent in very rare cases. If we have a clause of this type, we are only vesting a dictatorial power in the police officials, a power the magnitude of which we cannot conceive of now. That is the reason why I want this clause to be deleted completely from the Bill."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, this is not a new or strange provision. Such a provision is there in almost every such Act. Further, there is a proviso which even restricts the old order of things. I wish to add this. Here are police officials who must necessarily come in daily contact and conflict with those concerned with the running of buses and lorries. We know how things are going on and even hon. Members on the other

9th December 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

side complained that many wrong things were being done. Without the police checking and constantly supervising, this business cannot go on at all. If every policeman has to do his duty with the expectation or fear or apprehension that next morning on a private complaint he will be hauled up before a sub-magistrate, work cannot go on at all. Therefore, I submit that, with all the inconvenience and with all the doubts, the Opposition must allow this provision."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sir, as a matter of fact, this provision was considered by the Select Committee, and it was at the instance of Mr. T. Viswanatham that the previous sanction of the Government was restricted to proceedings in a criminal court. With regard to civil action, it is open to the party to go to the court directly."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I am sorry the Hon. Finance Minister has taken us into another aspect and made it appear as though this clause was passed in the Select Committee with my consent. I objected to the whole clause in the original Bill. My power of persuasion could not go beyond making the Government omit civil suits from the clause. They retained the rest. It does not mean that I was in agreement with it.

" The Hon. Chief Minister asked whether it would be possible for officers to work with the prospect of their being prosecuted or hauled up the next day in some criminal court."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Even a private complaint will do."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I submit that a provision like this will surely make the officials reckless and callous to people's conveniences.

" For the other argument that this is not a new provision and that a similar provision exists in so many other Acts, I respectfully submit that those so many other Acts too will have to be revised soon."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Sir, I am opposing the clause on an entirely different ground. Our Constitution has laid down equality before law. Why is the previous sanction of the Government necessary for prosecuting a police or any other Government official and why is it not necessary in the case of others? The Hon. Chief Minister said that the officials should not be in fear of having to answer a court summons at any time. The same question applies to private individuals, particularly politicians. We also stand in fear of having to answer summons and in fear of arrest with the prospect of no bail being granted. Why should the police officer or the Government official alone stand on a different footing? I submit that where private parties have got definite allegations to make, it must be left to the magistrate to decide whether a

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[9th December 1952]

prima facie case is made out. What else is the magistrate there for? Once a complaint is given to him, it is not always that a magistrate takes it on his file. He makes a *prima facie* enquiry or he throws it away. This is what normally happens. To invest the executive with the power to decide whether a particular prosecution has got to be launched or not, or whether a private individual can be allowed to prosecute an officer of the Government, is a very dangerous provision. It gives immunity to the officials to do what they please. Therefore, I oppose the clause."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, these operators enjoy a limited amount of monopoly, and they must accept such conditions."

Clause 17 was put and carried.

Clause 18.

SRI S. VEMIAH :—" Sir, I move—

'For the words "six months" in the last line, substitute the words "one year".'

"In moving this amendment, I submit that the six months' time provided in this clause is very limited, and any party may not be in a position to obtain financial and other assistance to launch a prosecution or to file a suit against orders passed. I do not wish to take much of the time of the House on this subject. I only request the Government to extend the time-limit from six months to one year."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" I second the amendment for the following reason. Suits and prosecutions should be instituted against the Government within six months from the date of the act complained of, according to this clause. Why we are pleading for a period of one year instead of six months is this. In a different clause dealing with payment of dues to Government, the operators have been given some concession. For instance, the Government are incapacitated from recovering arrears of taxes or dues to the Government, if the taxes or dues should relate to a period beyond one year. If an operator has to pay some money to the Government which has not been paid in due time, that amount cannot be recovered after the lapse of one year. (Interruption.) Such a concession has been given to the operator. When that is given, it is only logical that he should be given a time-limit of one year so that he can muster sufficient strength, strength in the sense that some of the bus operators are not well acquainted with the Act and they have always to go to their advocates to understand what exactly their position is. These people must, therefore, be given a reasonable opportunity to know exactly where they stand and where exactly the Government have gone wrong. It will be nothing but justice meted out to them if one year's time is given to the bus operators."

9th December 1952]

* SRI M. NARAYANASWAMY:—“అధ్యక్ష, ఈనాడు ప్రేమయ్య గారు ప్రతిపాదించిన సవరణను నేను బలపరచుచున్నాను. ఈ క్లాజు ద్వారా పోలీసు అధికారులకు అదనపు అధికారాలు యివ్వబడ్డాయి. పోలీసు ఆఫీసర్లు అసగా స్పూర్తి ఇన్స్ పెక్టర్లుగాని, సబ్-ఇన్స్ పెక్టర్లుగాని అనేక వ్యవహారములుచేస్తూఉంటారు. వారికి గవర్నమెంటు తరపున పనిచేస్తున్న, లేక వారి స్వంతపనులు ఉన్నను యీ బస్సులను, లారీలను తెప్పించుకొని పని చేయించుకొంటూ ఉంటారు. బస్సు ఆప రేట్లుగాని, లారీ ఆపరేట్లుగాని పోలీసువారికి లోంగి ఉండనియెడల, అక్రమపు కేసు పెట్టుతారనే బయోంకోనికవలన యీ ఆపరేట్లు లోంగి ఉంటారు. అలా పోలీసు వారి పనులు నెరవేర్చుటకు నిరాకరించినయెడల కేసులు పెట్టి యీ ఆపరేట్లును కష్టాల పాలుచేస్తారు. యీ ఆపరేట్లు గవర్నమెంటు మీదకాని పోలీసు ఆఫీసర్లు మీదకాని కేసు పెట్టాలంటే, యీ ఆపరేట్లకు ఆరు నెలలు గడువుపూత్రం యీ క్లాజులో provide చేసియున్నది. ఈ గడువు చాలదు. వలసంటే వాటికి తగిన రికార్డుగాని, యింకను కేసుకు సంబంధించిన పనులు నెరవేర్చుకొని కేసు పెట్టటానికి గడువు సరిపోదు గనుక, ఒక సంవత్సరమైనను గడువు కావలసివుంటుంది. అందువల్ల యీ క్లాజులో ఆరు నెలలు అనే మాటను ఒక సంవత్సరముగా మార్చగోరు చున్నాను.”

* SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY:—“Sir, in supporting this amendment, I wish to point out that this is a special concession shown to the police officers against any prosecution being launched by private parties. There is no limitation to a criminal prosecution under the Criminal Procedure Code and also under the special laws. I see no corresponding provision in the Bill in favour of the bus owners against prosecutions by the Government. The bus owners also must be given a corresponding time-limit for any prosecutions against them. This concession is only to safeguard the police officers and other Government officials against prosecutions by private individuals. The amendment only seeks to extend the time-limit from six months to one year. I hope, Sir, that the Hon. Minister will be pleased to accept this very modest amendment.”

* SRI V. SRI KRISHNA:—“అధ్యక్ష, బిల్లులోని 18 వ క్లాజుకు తెచ్చిన సవరణలను నేను బలపరుస్తున్నాను. ఈ బిల్లుగా యీ 17 వ క్లాజు, 18 వ క్లాజు పోలీసు ఆఫీసర్లకే సహాయంగా యీ బిల్లులో చేర్చారు. పోలీసులు మాత్రం రుజువులేకపోయినా, అనుమానమీదనే మెనార్లీలు వేయవచ్చునని, పోలీసులు అక్రమంచేస్తే మాత్రం ప్రభుత్వం అనుమతి పొందానని, ఆరు మాసాల గడువులోపలనే యీ తథ్యంకమంతా జరగాలని వుంది. ఇది నిరంకశరాజ్యంగాని కొకచిహ్నం. పోలీసులకు లేని హక్కులను పోలీసులకు యివ్వటం, పోలీసులకు రక్షణ, పోలీసులకు దండన: ఈ సూత్రాన్నే వ్యతిరేకిస్తున్నాం. ఈ క్లాజువల్ల పోలీసువారు నిరంకుశ రాజ్యం యీ ఆపరేట్లమీద చలాయించటానికి వీలవుతుంది. తప్పుచేసినా చేయకపోయినా, యీ ఆపరేట్లను బెదిరించి, వాళ్ల బస్సులు, లారీలు పోయిండా ఏదో ఒక మిష కల్పించి, వాళ్లకు నష్టముచేతున్న ఆవకాశం యీ పోలీసు ఆఫీసర్లకు యీ క్లాజు వలన లభ్యమవుతుంది. అక్రమంగా డబ్బు జూన్తిగా వసూలు చేసేరనిగాని, తదితర అన్యాయపు కేసులు పెట్టటానికి వీలవుతుంది. ఆపరేట్లు యీ వుద్యోగస్థులమీద కేసు పెట్టాలంటే యీ క్లాజులో ఆరు నెలల పరిమితి పెట్టివుంది. ఈ గడువు చాలదు.

[Sri V. Sri Krishna]

[9th December 1952]

ప్రభుత్వం తమ పోలీసువారిని రక్షించటానికై యీ క్లాజులో యీ కొద్దిపాటి గడుపు పెట్టారు. గడుపు చాలకను, ప్రతిదానికిని ఆక్రమపు కేసులు యీ పోలీసు వారు పెట్టి తడవతడవకు, యీ బస్సులను లారీలను పనికి బంగారేసి, ఆపరేటర్లకు నష్టము వాటిల్లగలుగ చేస్తారని, భయపడి యీ ఆపరేటర్లు ప్రభుత్వంమీద కేసులు పెట్టుకుండా మానుకొందురు. అందుకనే ప్రభుత్వం యీ కొద్ది గడుపు పెట్టింది. యీ క్లాజు ముఖ్యంగా పోలీసువారు ఆపరేటర్లమీద ప్రతి చిన్న విషయమునకు బస్సులను, లారీలను ఆపుచేసి డ్రైవరుకు తీసుకుపోయి, ఆక్కడ యీ ఆపరేటర్ల వద్దనుంచి ఒక రూపాయి, మూడు రూపాయలు, లేక ఐదు రూపాయలు మామూళ్లు వసూలుచేస్తారు. పోలీసువారి మాట వినకపోతే, ఆక్రమపు కేసులు పెట్టుతారు. పోలీసువారు చెప్పినదాని కనుగుణంగా పోతూంటే, మామూళ్లు తెచ్చుంటారు. అసలే యీ బస్సులకు, లారీలకు ప్రభుత్వముకు పన్నులే చెల్లించలేకుండా అవస్థలు పడుతూ యుంటే, యింకను యీ అదనపు ఖర్చులకు యీ ఆపరేటర్లను యీ పోలీసు వారు గురిచేస్తారు. పన్నుల భారముతో యీ ఆపరేటర్లు అనేక యిబ్బందులు పడి ప్రభుత్వానికి డబ్బు కట్టుకూపుండవలసివస్తే, యింకను యీ అదనపు యిబ్బం దులుగూడ ఈ ఆపరేటర్లకు కలిగించబడుతున్నవి. ఇలాంటి యిబ్బందులు ఎన్నో అయినను పెద్దపెద్ద బస్సు owners లారీ owners తట్టుకోగలగుదురేకాని, చిన్న చిన్న ఆపరేటర్లు బొత్తిగాతట్టుకోలేకను, యీ పోలీసువారికి మామూళ్లు యిచ్చుకోలేకను చిట్ట చివరికి యీ బస్సులు, లారీలు అమ్ముకోవలసిన స్థితికి యీ పోలీసువారు తెస్తారు. ఒకవేళ ఆక్రమపు కేసు పోలీసువారు పెట్టారని కోర్టులో complaint వేస్తే యింకను ఆక్రమపు కేసులు అడుగు అడుగుకు పోలీసువారు యీ ఆపరేటర్ల మీద పెట్టుతారు. ఈ కారణాలవల్ల యీ 17, 18 క్లాజులు రెండును ఆపరేటర్లను చాలా కష్టాలవలె చేయును గనుకనున్నా, పోలీసువాకి ఆక్రమపుకేసులు యీ ఆప రేటర్లమీద పెట్టేటందుకు అవకాశాలు త్నన్నవి గనుకనున్నా, యీ క్లాజులు సవరిం చాలని కోరుతున్నాను."

3-50
P.m.

* SRI K. RAJAGOPALARAO:—"Sir, ఇట్టిల్లులోని 18 వ క్లాజునుగరించి నేను ఒక విషయము చెప్పదలచుచున్నాను. ఈ క్లాజులో ఆరు నెలల గడుపు ఎత్తివేసి ఒక సంవత్సరము గడుపు పెట్టువని కోరే సవరణ చాలా ముఖ్యమైనటువంటిది. ఈ క్లాజు సవరించకుండా అంగీకరించినట్లయితే ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులు విడుదలచేసినను, ఎలా ప్రవర్తించినను, అడిగేదానికి అవకాశాలు లేకుండాపోతుంది. అందువల్ల ప్రభుత్వో ద్యోగులయొక్క ప్రకారమాత్రం లోపముగా ఉండినప్పటికిని, యీ ఆపరేటర్లమీద కేసులు తగ్గించటానికి తగిన అవకాశాలు యివ్వకపోతే traffic పడిపోతుందనిచెప్పాలి. యీ క్లాజులో ఆరుమాసాలు గడుపు ఒక సంవత్సరానికి పొడిగించమని కోరగా అంగీ కరించక పోవటం నాకు అసౌకావహంబేదు. Bus operators కు, lorry operators కు తగిన సౌకర్యాలు కల్పించితేనేగదా ప్రభుత్వమునకు ఆదాయం వస్తుంది. అటువంటి దానికి బదులు నష్టాలు కలిగించి, traffic కు యిబ్బందులు తెచ్చే క్లాజు పెట్టే ప్రయో జనముండదు. వాస్తవంగా పోలీసు ఉద్యోగుల ప్రవర్తన ఎలావున్నా, బస్సు ఆపరే టర్లగున్నా, లారీ ఆపరేటర్లగున్నా, తగిన రక్షణ కల్పించకపోతే, ప్రభుత్వానికి నిజంగా యీ ఆపరేటర్లమీద సదుద్దేశ్యమున్నట్లు కనిపించదు. యీ ఆపరేటర్లమీద పోలీసు ఆక్రమ చర్యలు తగ్గించాలని, యీ ఆపరేటర్లకు తగిన రక్షణ కల్పించాలని ప్రభు త్వానికి సదుద్దేశ్యముంటే, యీ క్లాజులోని ఆరు నెలల గడుపు మార్చి ఒక సంవత్స రముకు పొడిగించటానికి ఏలుగా యీ క్లాజు మార్చమని కోరుతున్నాను."

9th December 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Sir, without any further argument, I am prepared to accept the amendment, on behalf of the Government. I do not think we need argue about it hereafter.” (Cheers.)

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ For the words “ six months ” in the last line of clause 18, substitute the words “ one year ”.’ ”

The amendment was carried.

* SRI P. S. KRISHNASWAMI AYYANGAR :—“ On a point of information, Sir. The institution of proceedings has got to be sanctioned by a departmental officer. Is the time-limit fixed to commence from the date of the decision given or from the date of the commission of the offence? That has got to be made clear.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The time-limit has been extended to one year, by our accepting the amendment. Therefore, this need not arise.”

Clause 18, as amended, was put and carried.

THE SCHEDULE.

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Sir, I move—

‘ In paragraph 1 of the Schedule—

(i) in clause (a), for the words “ eight annas ”, substitute the words “ six annas ” and after the word “ permitted ” insert the words “ or at the option of the operator, of twelve rupees and eight annas per seat per quarter ”;

(ii) in clause (b), for the words “ one rupee and eight annas per day ”, substitute the words “ twenty-two rupees and eight annas per month ”;

(iii) in the Explanation at the end, for the words “ the fee of eight annas per seat per year per mile ”, substitute the words “ one-third of the fee per seat ”.

“ Sir, it is obvious and I think hon. Members will agree that the Government have been very reasonable and generous in reducing the fee, because the argument that Members were adducing 24 hours before has met with the response of the Government. We agree with them and we, therefore, lower the rates both in the case of the stage carriages and the lorries.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ అధ్యక్షా, యవర్న మెంటు amendment నా amendment రెండు ప్రశ్నవి. యవర్న మెంటు amendment లో composition fee రూ 22-8-0 ప్రశ్నవి. నా amendment లో దానిని రూ 15-0-0 చేయమని అంటున్నాను. అందువల్ల నా amendment ను ఓటుకు పెట్టినతర్వాత అది carryout అయితే, ఇక యవర్న మెంటు amendment లో అవసరముండదు. ఇంకొక amendment ఏమిది అతాల్కు యదులు నాలుగు అతాలు చేయమనిని మరొకటి రూ 1-8-0 నుంచి 0-8-0 లకు తగ్గించాలనిని కోరుతున్నాను.”

[9th December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Is the hon. Member not moving his amendment? ”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ నా amendment లను move చేయమంటే చేస్తాను ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Let the hon. Member move his amendment as an amendment to the Government amendment.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ Sir, I move the following amendment :—

(i) In paragraph 1, clause (a), for the words “ eight annas ”, substitute the words “ four annas ”.

(ii) In paragraph 1, clause (b), for the words “ one rupee and eight annas ”, substitute the words “ eight annas ”.

According to the Government amendment, the composition fee is Rs. 22-8-0, whereas according to my amendment, it will come to Rs. 15. My amendment is a very reasonable one. “అధ్యక్ష, నా amendment చాలా సరసమైనటువంటిదని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. దానిని ఆమోదించాలని కోరుతున్నాను. ఎందుకంటే నేను యీవిషయమే ఒక మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. సభ్యులలో చాలామంది యీ బస్సు ఆపరేటర్ల విషయమును గాని, లారీ ఆపరేటర్ల విషయముగాని, వారు యెన్ని యిబ్బందులకు లోనై యీ బస్సులు లారీలు నడుపుతుంటున్నారో దివరకు ప్రభుత్వానికి వస్తు కట్టలేని స్థితికి వచ్చినప్పుడు అవి ఆమ్ముకోవలసిన పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడుతున్నవని ఇదివరకే ప్రభుత్వానికి మనవి చేసియున్నారు. దేశంలో ఒకటో, రెండో బస్సులుగాని లారీలుగాని వెట్టుకొని జీవించేవారు, సాధారణంగా బీదవారై ఉంటారు. ఇంకూడా ఏ మార్కెటింగ్ కో ఆపర్సులు తెచ్చుకొని ఈ బండలను యేర్పాటుచేసుకొని జీవిస్తున్నారని ఇదివరకే ప్రభుత్వానికి విన్నవించుకొని యున్నాము. ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఈ విషయము గమనించియే వారు ఏర్పరిచిన రేట్లుకు తగ్గించటానికి అనుమతించారు. అంటే బస్సుల విషయంలో మైలుకు సీటుకు ఎనిమిది అణాలనుంచి అరు అణాలున్నూ, లారీల విషయములో మైలుకు దినమునకు రూ 1-8-0 బదులు quarter కు రూ 22-8-0 లకు తగ్గించటానికి ఒప్పుకొన్నారు. కాని యిది చాలాదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. నేను సభ్యులలో చాలామందికి నచ్చజెప్పి ఈ amendment ను move చేశాను. అంటే బస్సుల విషయములో సీటుకు ఎనిమిది అణాలకు బదులు అరు అణాలుకాకుండా నాలుగు అణాలు వెయ్యివని కోరుతున్నాను. లారీల విషయంలో గుర్తుమెంటు వారు వప్పుకున్న రేటు రూ 22-8-0 లకు బదులు యింకను తగ్గించి రూ 15-0-0 చేయవని కోరుతున్నాను. ఈ విషయములలో యీ ఆపరేటర్ల పరిస్థితులు ప్రభుత్వ కనికరముతో గుర్తించాలి. ఇదివరకు యుద్ధము సమయములో రైల్వే రాకపోకలు తగ్గినందువల్ల బస్సులలో ఆధికలాభములు సంపాదించి యుండవచ్చును. కాని పరిస్థితులు అప్పుటి కన్న యిప్పుడు చాలా మారియున్నవి. లారీల విషయములో ఒక విషయము గమనించాలని విజ్ఞప్తిచేస్తున్నాను. లారీలకు ప్రతిదినమును గిరాకి వుండదు. నెలకు ఏ 10, 15 దినములలో పని వుంటుంది. దీనిగూడా competition వుండటము వల్ల లారీ యజమానులు ప్రభుత్వమునకు చెందవలసిన పన్నుకొరతైనను యీ లారీలను నడవవలసి వుంటుంది. ఒకప్పుడు గిరాకి రాకపోయినా చాడగ వచ్చినప్పుడైనా, యీ నష్టము పూర్తిచేసికొందురు గనుక ప్రభుత్వంవారిని నేను తెచ్చిన సవరణను గుర్తించి

9th December 1952] [Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu]

అమోదింపాలని కోరుతున్నాను. నిజంగా, చిన్న చిన్న లారీ యజమానులు కొంతమంది బీదవారై ఉండుటవల్ల, ఒక్కొక్కప్పుడు ఈ లారీలను నడవలేని స్థితిలో ఉంటున్నారు. ప్రభుత్వ పన్ను కట్టటానికైనను ఈ ఆపరేటర్లకు అవకాశమివ్వవలెను. అధిక పన్నులు వేసినయెడల ఈ బస్సులుగాని, లారీలుగాని నడువలేక ఆపవోవలసిన పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడుతాయి. ప్రభుత్వ పన్నులే కాకుండా ఈ బండ్లకు tyres, spare parts వగైరా కొనుక్కొనేందుకు అనేక ఖర్చులుండును. ఇవన్నియు భరించగలగే ఈ ఆపరేటర్లకు ఇస్తేనేగాని, వీరు ప్రభుత్వమునకు కట్టవలసిన పన్ను మొలభముగా చెల్లించలేరు. పన్నులు కట్టలేక బస్సులు అగిపోవలసివస్తే, ప్రయాణీకులకు యిబ్బందిగలుగను. అందువల్ల ఈ రేట్లు ఏదో ఒక ఖచ్చితమైన basis మీద ఏర్పాటుచేయాలని విజ్ఞప్తి చేస్తున్నాను. నేను కోరే రేటులు విమనగా సామాన్య అన్నింటిలోను గవర్నమెంటు ఇప్పుడు వచ్చుకున్న రేట్లకు బదులు మొదట ఏర్పరచిన రేట్లకు 50% తగ్గించాలి అని కోరుతున్నాను. అంటే బస్సుల విషయములో నీటుకు మైలుకు 8 అణాలు బదులు 4 అణాలున్నూ, లారీల విషయంలో యిప్పుడు వచ్చుకున్న ప్రకారం quarter కు రూ 22-8-0 లు బదులు రూ 15 లు చేయాలని కోరుతున్నాను. నేనుకోరే రేట్లు చాలా సబబైనవి కాబట్టి ఈ రేట్లు వచ్చగోగలండులకు ప్రభుత్వానికి విజ్ఞప్తి చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ విషయములు అన్నియును ప్రభుత్వము వారు గమనించి, ఈ ఆపరేటర్లు బీదవారగుటవల్లను వారి కుటుంబములు నాశనము కాకుండా జీవించగలందులకును సబబయిన రేట్లు నేను కోరిన ప్రకారం అమోదించి నా సవరణను అంగీకరించమని ప్రభుత్వాని కోరుతున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER :—"The hon. Member Sri V. Sri Krishna has given notice of a similar amendment. Let him not move it. Instead, he may second the amendment of the hon. Member Sri Venkateswarlu and speak on it."

*SRI V. SRI KRISHNA :—"అభ్యుత్తర, శ్రీ వెంకటేశ్వర్లుగారు ప్రతిపాదించిన 4 p.m. సవరణను నేను బలపరుస్తున్నాను. ఈ సవరణ చాలా సబబైనటువంటిది. మంత్రిగారు మేము చేప్పేది సావధానంగా విని సమాధానం యివ్వవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను. అనంత పురం జిల్లా విషయాలు ఆడిగితే తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు సంబంధించిన ఆంశాలపై సమాధానం ఇవ్వబడినట్లు మాత్రం కాక మా ప్రసంగాలను సావధానంగా ఓరిమిలోవిని సవరణను అమోదింపవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను. మా వాదనను అపార్థం చేసుకొనక న్యాయమైన విషయాన్ని గమనించవలెనని మంత్రిగారికి విజ్ఞప్తి చేస్తున్నాను. 8 అణాలు అని ఉన్న రేటును 6 అణాలు తగ్గించవలెనని మంత్రిగారి సవరణతెచ్చారు అంటే మొట్టమొదట వారు అభిప్రాయపడినట్లుగా కాకుండా 8 అణాలు రేటు విధించినట్లయితే బస్ యజమానులకు విశేషనష్టం వాటిల్లుతుందనే కారణంవల్లనే వాళ్లు 6 అణాలకు తగ్గించవలెనని సవరణను ప్రతిపాదించారు. అదే కారణం చేత నేను దానిని ఇంకను తగ్గించవలెనని 4 అణాలు రేటుకుమాత్రమే తగ్గించవలెనని ప్రభుత్వంవారికి తెలియ జేస్తున్నాను. నీటు 1 కి సంతవర్సరానికి మైలుకు 6 అణాలు చొప్పున వసూలు చేసినట్లయితే ఎంత హెచ్చు మొత్తాన్ని బస్ ఆపరేటర్లు ఇచ్చుకోవలసి వస్తుందో గమనించండి. బస్ ఆపరేటర్లకు ముఖ్యంగా ఒకటి రెండు బస్సులు పెట్టుకొని నడుపుతున్న చిన్న ఆపరేటర్లకు చెప్పుకోతగ్గ లాభాలేమీ రావడం లేదు. అనేకమంది నష్టాలు భరింపవలసి వస్తోంది. కాబట్టి మా సవరణను అంగీకరించి రేటును 4 అణాలకు తగ్గించవలెనని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను."

[Sri V. Sri Krishna]

[9th December 1952]

“రెండవది లారీల విషయం. ఈ లారీలవారు రోజుకు రూపాయిన్నర చొప్పున యిచ్చుకోవాలని మొదటి షెడ్యూలులో చేర్చారు. దానికీమాడా మంత్రిగారు ఒక సవరణను యిచ్చారు. దాని ప్రకారం నెలకు 22-8-0 రూపాయిల ఆదనపు పన్నును లారీ యజమానులు కట్టవలసి వుంది. అంతే రూపాయిన్నర రేటును ప్రభుత్వంవారు 12 అణాలకు తగ్గించ గలిగారన్న మాట. ఇదికూడా చాలా హెచ్చు పన్ను అనే మా ఆధిపత్యం. దానిని 8 అణాలకు తగ్గించవలెనని మా సవరణ. లారీలు హెచ్చు పన్నును భరించలేవని మాత్రం మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. బస్సులు రోజూ ప్రయాణం చేయవచ్చుచేమాగాని, లారీలకు ప్రతి రోజు పని వుండదు. వెలలో చాలా రోజులు పని లేక ఆవి నిలచిపోయి వుంటాయి. కొన్ని కొన్ని సీజనులలో లెక్క లారీలకు హెచ్చు పని వుండదు. సాధారణంగా నెలలో 10, 15 రోజులు మాత్రమే ఆవి నడుస్తాయి. అంతేకాకుండా ఈ లారీలను నడిపే యజమానులలో చాలామంది పేదవారు. కండక్టర్లు, డ్రైవర్లు, మాజీ వైసిసీలు మొదలైనవారు ఏ పాఠశాలకువద్దో అప్పు తెచ్చుకొని వాయిదామీద చెల్లించుకొంటూ, లారీలను నడుపుకొంటున్నారు. అటువంటివారిని నెలకు రూ. 22-8-0 ఇవ్వమనడం చాలా అన్యాయం. ఈ విషయమై ప్రభుత్వంవారు పునరాలోచన చేయవలెనని విజ్ఞప్తి చేస్తున్నాను.

“మరొక విషయంకూడా గమనించవలసియున్నది. గాస్ ట్యాంక్స్ ప్రభుత్వం వారి హయాములో బస్ రూట్లు చాలావరకు మృత్యుల బంధు మిత్రులకు, అనూ యాయుమానులకు మాత్రమే ఈయబడినవి. వారు ఈ రూట్లలో బస్లను నడవకుండా వాటిని ఇతరులకు రూటు ఒకటింటికీ 15 వేలు, 20 వేలు ఉచితార్థంగా తీసుకొని అమ్మివేశారు. ఇప్పుడు బస్లను నడుపుచున్నవారిలో చాలామంది ఈవిధంగా రూట్లు కొనుక్కొన్నవారే. అట్టివారిపై ఈ ఆదనపు పన్నులను కనుక విధించినట్లయితే వారు విశేష నష్టానికి గురిగావలసి వస్తుందని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఇదివరకటి మంత్రివర్గంవారి ఆశ్రయ పడుచావలెననే ఈనాడు బస్ పరిశ్రమ ఎంతో నష్టదాయకంగా పరిణమించినది. ఈ విషయంగురించి శ్రీరాజగోపాలాచారిగారు విచారణ జరిపించవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా ఒకటి, రెండు, మూడు బస్లను పెట్టుకొని కాలక్షేపం చేస్తున్నటు వంటి చిన్న చిన్న వారికి ఈ ఆదనపు పన్ను తగులకుండ చూడవలెనని మంత్రిగారిని కోరుతున్నాను. మిత్రులు గోపాలకృష్ణయ్యగారు ఈ బిల్లుపై మాట్లాడుతూ ఈ రాష్ట్రంలో ఉన్న బస్ యజమానులలో ఎవరికి ఎన్నెన్ని బస్లు ఉన్నాయి అనే విషయమై అంకెలను ఇచ్చి ఉన్నారు. వాటిని గమనించినట్లయితే మూడు బస్లవరకు ఉన్నవారు అందరుకలిగి ఉన్న బస్ల సంఖ్య మొత్తం బస్ల సంఖ్యలో నూటికి అయిదు వంతులకు (5%) మించరని తెలుసుకొనవచ్చు, ఈ విషయముల నన్నింటిని గమనించి ఈ పన్ను రేటులను తగ్గించుటకుగాను శ్రీ వెంకటేశ్వర్లుగారు ఇచ్చిన సవరణను ఆమోదించవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The hon. Member Sri D. Seetharamiah may move his amendment.”

* SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“అధ్యక్షా, ప్రభుత్వంవారు ప్రతిపాదించిన సవరణలను ప్రతిఘటిస్తూ, schedule కు నా సవరణ ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను. నా సవరణ ఇది :

‘(i) In paragraph (1) (a), for the words “eight annas” substitute the words “two annas”, and correct the Schedule accordingly.

8th December 1952] [Sri D. Seetharamiah]

(ii) In paragraph (1) (b), for the words "one rupee and eight annas per day", substitute the words "rupees twenty per quarter."

"మొదటగాని పేర్కొన (1) (ఎ) లో ఉదహరించబడిన ఎనిమిది అణాలు అనే దానికి బదులు రెండు అణాలు అని ఉండవలెనని నా అభిప్రాయం. అలాగే పేర్కొన (1) (బి) లో రోజుకు రూ. 1-8-0 కు బదులు ఒక క్వార్టరుకు అనగా మూడు మాసములకు 20 రూపాయలు ఉండవలెననికూడా అభిప్రాయము. ప్రభుత్వం వారు ప్రతిపాదించిన సవరణలో బస్ లకు సంబంధించినంతవరకు సీటుకు రూ. 0-8-0 లకు బదులు రూ. 0-6-0 లు మాత్రమే విధించవలెనని ఉన్నది. వారు ఈ మొత్తాన్ని రూ. 0-6-0 లకు తగ్గించినప్పటికీ బస్ యజమానులకు చాలా నష్టం సంభవిస్తుందని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ నాడు బస్ యజమానులు, ముఖ్యంగా రెండు, మూడు బస్ ల వరకు మాత్రమే ఉన్న వారు ఈనాడు ఇదివరకువలె విశేష లాభాలను గడించలేక పోతున్నారు. ఈ ఆదనపు పన్నులనే కాకుండా బస్ యజమానులు, లారీ యజమానులు పోలీసులకు, ఇతరులకు ఎక్స్ ప్లెండ్ చాలు, మామూర్లు ఇచ్చుకోవలసి ఉంది. అనేకవిధములైన పోలీసు జులముకు తల ఒగ్గవలసి ఉంది. ఈ ఖర్చులకుతోడు ఈ ఆదనపు శిస్తునుకూడా వారిమీద విధించినట్లయితే వారు బస్సులను, లారీలను ఆమ్ముకొనవలసి వస్తుందని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఈనాడు మంత్రిగారు ప్రవేశపెట్టిన సవరణచేత కారమైనట్లయితే ఒక్కొక్క బస్ ఇకమీదట సంవత్సరానికి 1,250 రూపాయలవరకు ఆదనంగా పన్ను చెల్లించవలసి వస్తుంది. ఇది చిన్నవారు భరించరానంత శిస్తు అని తిరిగి తెలియచేస్తున్నాను.

"ఇక బస్ రూట్లు ఇచ్చే విషయంలోకూడా చాలా అన్యాయం జరుగుతోంది. 4-10 ఎంతో అవధిపడి, ఎందరో ఉద్యోగులకు లంచాలిస్తేనేగాని remission ఇవ్వడం లేదు. అనేక బస్ లు రూట్లు జిల్లాలో క్యాండ్లెస్ వెనిడెంట్లయొక్క, మంత్రి యొక్క బంధుమిత్రులకే ఇవ్వబడినవి. వీరందరు పెద్దపెద్ద ఖాస్సాములు. హెన్రు సంఖ్యలో బస్సులు పెట్టుకొని, లిమిటెడ్ కంపెనీలస్వరూపంలో విర్బడి కొద్దిపాటి బండ్లను పెట్టుకొని మోటారు రవాణా వ్యాపారం చేసుకొనే చిన్న యజమానులను ఈ కంపెనీల వారు ఎంతో వాధపెడుతున్నారు. ఈ కారణంచేత చిన్న యజమానులు తమ బస్సులను పెద్ద కంపెనీలవారికి అమ్ముకొనిపోవలసి వస్తుంది. తత్ఫలితంగా మోటారు రవాణా వ్యాపారం గుర్రవ్యాపారస్తుల హస్తగతమై పోతుందని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. కాబట్టి బస్సులపై లారీలపై వేసిన ఈ ఆదనపు పన్నును తగ్గించవలసినదనే నా సవరణను ప్రభుత్వం వారు అంగీకరించగోరుతాను."

SRI K. MALAKONDAYYA :— "అధ్యక్ష, సీతారామయ్యగారు ప్రతిపాదించిన సవరణను నేను బలపరుస్తున్నాను. ఈనాడు బస్ యజమానులు, లారీ యజమానులు ఇదివరకువలె హెచ్చు లాభాలు సంపాదించలేకుండా పున్నారు. ముఖ్యంగా చిన్న చిన్న యజమానులకు పోటీ వ్యాపారంపై ఎంతో నష్టంకూడా సంభవిస్తోంది. అంతేకాకుండా మరొక విషయం గుర్తుంచుకోవాలి. జిల్లాలలో రోడ్లు మద్రాసు నగరములో ఉన్న రోడ్లవలె ఉండవు. ఇక్కడ రోడ్లు తారు పూయబడి నున్నగా ఉంటాయి కాని జిల్లాలలో ఉండే రోడ్లు చాలా అభాగ్యవృత్తి నీతిలో ఉన్నాయి. మిట్ట, పల్లాలలోను, గుంటలలోను అవి నిండి ఉంటాయి. ఇందువల్ల జిల్లాలలోని బస్ యజమానులు, ట్రెయిలరికారు, ఇతర spare parts నిమిత్తం ఎంతో హెచ్చుగా ఖర్చు పెట్టవలసివుంది. ఈనాడు

[Sri K. Malakondayya] [9th December 1952]

ఒక్కొక్క టైరు వెల అయిదు, ఆరు వందల రూపాయలవరకు ఉంది. అంతే కాకుండా ఏ భాగమైనా చెబ్బితిన్నట్లయితే దానిని సరిచేసుకోవడానికి ఎక్స్ రోజులు వడుతుంది. మరమ్మత్తు జరుగుతున్న రోజులలో బస్సులుగాని, లారీలుగాని నడువలేవు. పెద్దపెద్ద స్టీట్లు ఉన్నవారైనట్లయితే ఒక బస్ కాకపోయినట్లయితే మరొక బస్సు నైనా లైసులో తిప్పుకోవారు. కాని చిన్నచిన్న వ్యాపారస్తులకు spare bus లు ఉండవు. ఈ కారణాలవల్ల వారికి విశేషంగా నష్టం సంభవిస్తోంది. ఇంతే కాకుండా ప్రతి రోజు వది, పన్నెండు రూపాయలైనా ఉంటేనే కాని ఒక్కొక్క బస్సును maintain చేయడం కష్టంగా ఉంది. ఈ ఖర్చులన్నిటికోడు వారు పోలీసులకు, ఇతర ఉద్యోగులకు లంచాలిని, మామూళ్లని ఇచ్చుకోవలసివుంది. లేకపోయినట్లయితే వారు బస్సులను తిప్పుకోవడమే కష్టమైపోతుంది. ఈ కారణముల నన్నింటిని గమనించి ఈ సవరణను అంగీకరించవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi may move his amendment.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ The amendment that stands in my name is a consequential one. Had some other amendment been moved and accepted, then my amendment would have some meaning. Therefore, I do not propose to move the amendment.”

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ Sir, I am supporting the amendment moved by the hon. Member Sri Venkateswarlu. The original Bill as presented to the House contemplated charging one anna on every rupee collected as fare in the case of a stage carriage and as freight in the case of a public carrier. The Government were good enough to reduce it from one anna to nine pies in the case of a stage carriage and half-anna in the case of a public carrier. What was the reason which impelled them to reduce it in spite of the deficit in the Budget? It was done because to a certain extent they were convinced of the desirability of reducing it. Now, the same Government come forward to reduce the rate of compounding fees from eight annas to six annas. Let us take it for granted that generosity impels them to reduce it. We plead once again that it may be reduced from eight annas to four annas.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Then we will have to retrace our step.”

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ If you like it, you may do so. Sir, in my aside talk with the Hon. Minister, I was given to understand that most of the bus operators would resort to this sort of composition fee rather than to submit the accounts monthly and then willingly pay the fees due to the Government. So, they will first commit the offence . . .” (Interruption.)

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Let not the hon. Member be disturbed.”

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ I was given to understand from reliable quarters in the House that most of the operators would resort to this kind of thing. The Government should not have this kind of suspicion while bringing forward a Bill. Of course,

9th December 1952] [Sri K. Vinayakam]

if they are serious, I will give them food for thought. If they have guts, let them enquire into the cases that I shall presently cite. The Government are thinking of such bus-owners who will always be trying to bypass the law and who will be willing to pay the compounding fees. They should not come to the conclusion that all bus operators are bad people."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I think the hon. Member Sri Vinayakam is making a mistake. This is not like a forest offence where compounding takes place after an offence is committed. This is not compounding in that sense. Here, even beforehand the concerned person comes to an agreement."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"I have known cases where people with some influence manage to get permits for bus routes and sell them to others at heavy prices. This kind of people really should be punished by the Government. I shall give an instance now. The President of the Chittoor District Board has taken permits for 6 bus routes. But he has not run buses even in one route. He has sold the permits to others. It is for the Government to enquire into the matter."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Here, it is not a case of compounding after an offence is committed. It is a case of compounding the rate of taxation. It is not compounding for an offence at all."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Even if it is not a question of offence, if the rate of taxation is to be compounded, the Government have no right to come to the conclusion that most of the bus operators will only resort to this kind of composition fees rather than willingly pay the tax which is legitimately due from them to the Government. If they feel that all the bus operators are bad people, I shall give them some instances of people belonging to their own Party. Let them enquire into the instances I have cited."

* SRI K. VARADACHARI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have heard the large amount of appeal made to reduce the rates contained in the Schedule. So far as lorries are concerned, a strong plea has been entered into in respect of people who own a single lorry on the ground that they are poor people and that they should not be harassed by taxation of any kind. You may remember that, after the passing of the General Sales Tax Act, a large traffic in goods is being carried on through lorries and this traffic is going unaccounted for in a large measure. Nearly 80 per cent of this traffic is unaccounted for and it is not possible to levy any sales-tax on it because the officers of the Commercial Taxes Department have no power to stop lorries or to check the goods or to make any investigation into the matter, nor has such power been given to the Police and rightly so because it was not felt desirable to subject these dealers to any harassment. On the other hand, dealers have been making huge profits through these lorries without paying any

[Sri K. Varadachari]

[9th December 1952]

sales-tax at all. Now, this Bill contemplates taxation of another kind. At the same time, it may make it possible for the Government to get at a large part of the goods that are now escaping the payment of sales-tax. Sales-tax can be levied on these goods if only the rules framed under this Bill will go to the extent of enabling the officers of the Commercial Taxes Department to get at a correct estimate of the amount of traffic that is passing through the lorries. That is all I want to say."

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Sir, hon. Members have stated the difficulties which the bus-owners are put to and the possible defects of this Bill. All these points were answered by me while replying to the discussion on the first reading of the Bill. Hon. Members are just repeating what they have already said. But I can assure them that the Government themselves have realized some of those difficulties, and in clause 3 they have reduced the rate of tax from one anna to nine pies in the case of buses and from one anna to six pies in the case of lorries. As a consequence, we have to introduce this provision relating to composition fees. I must tell the hon. Member Sri Vinayakam that compounding of tax is not an offence. It is one method of paying the tax. The assessee can pay it at one time without getting into all the troubles and difficulties which he may otherwise be subjected to. There is nothing wrong or illegal in compounding the tax. It is right and it is an advantage both to the Government and to the party concerned. I, therefore, feel that, having regard to the difficulties and the financial requirements of the Government, the utmost we can give is that proposed in the Government amendment. I oppose all other amendments."

4-20
p.m.

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" అధ్యక్ష, మృతి గారు ఇచ్చిన సమాధానం చాలా అసంతృప్తికరంగాను, అసందర్భముగాను ఉన్నదని చెప్పటకు విచారిస్తున్నాను. మా వాదనలో తెలియజేసి issues వేటికీ ఆయన సరిగా జవాబులు తయారేదు. అందువల్ల నేను నా సవరణను press చేస్తున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Is the hon. Member Sri Seetharamiah pressing his amendment ? "

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—" అవునండీ. నేను నా సవరణను press చేస్తున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I shall now put the amendment of Sri P. Venkateswarlu to the vote of the House. The question is—

(i) In paragraph 1, clause (a), for the words " eight annas ", substitute the words " four annas ".

(ii) In paragraph 1, clause (b), for the words " one rupee and eight annas ", substitute the words " eight annas ".

The amendment was lost.

9th December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I shall now put the amendment of Sri D. Seetharamiah to the vote of the House. The question is—

(i) In paragraph (1) (a), for the words “ eight annas ”, *substitute* the words “ two annas ” and correct the Schedule accordingly.

(ii) In paragraph (1) (b), for the words “ one rupee and eight annas per day ”, *substitute* the words “ rupees twenty per quarter ”.

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I shall now put the Government amendment to the vote of the House. The question is—

‘ In paragraph 1—

“ (i) in clause (a), for the words ‘ eight annas ’, *substitute* the words ‘ six annas ’, and after the word ‘ permitted ’ *insert* the words ‘ or at the option of the operator, of twelve rupees and eight annas per seat per quarter ’ ;

(ii) in clause (b), for the words ‘ one rupee and eight annas per day ’, *substitute* the words ‘ twenty-two rupees and eight annas per month ’ ;

(iii) in the Explanation at the end, for the words ‘ the fee of eight annas per seat per year per mile ’, *substitute* the words ‘ one-third of the fee per seat ’ .”

The amendment was carried.

The Schedule, as amended, was put and carried.

Preamble and Clause 1.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Hon. Members Sri D. Seetharamiah, Sri V. Sri Krishna and Sri S. S. Kolkebaill have each given notice of an amendment to clause 1. The House having accepted another amendment in another place, they cannot now move these amendments. So, all those amendments are out of order.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ ఆధ్యక్ష, on a point of information, ఇన్ని సవరణలను అచ్చు వేశారు. మొట్టమొదట వీనిని అంగీకరించి, ఈ సవరణలపట్టికలో చేర్చి అచ్చు వేయించి, చివరకు చర్చకువచ్చే సందర్భంలో వాటిని out of order అని ప్రకటించడం వాగుండలేదు. అసెంబ్లీ శాస్త్రాలయంలో సెక్రటరీగారు ఈ సవరణలను admit చేయకచ్చునో లేదో ముందుగానే చూడవలసి ఉన్నది. ఏమైనప్పటికీ వీటిని అచ్చు వేసినారు కనుక ప్రతిపాదించుటలో తప్పేమి అని అడుగుతున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ That is the Parliamentary practice. Sri Krishna's amendment is out of order. He cannot move it.”

*SRI V. SRI KRISHNA :—“ ఆధ్యక్ష, ఈ పన్ను బిల్ ప్రాప్తయితున్న మీద విధిస్తున్నారా లేక వానెంజర్లమీదా, గుడ్డుమీద అని అడుగుతున్నాను. ఏదో మార్కానికి, బట్టలకు లాభాపేక్షలు కనిపిస్తోంది.”

[9th December 1952]

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ The hon. Member Sri V. Sri Krishna submits that these amendments after all do not go against the spirit of the further clauses of the Bill. The Bill seeks to impose a tax on passengers, whereas in reality it is a tax on other things.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I have already told the House that we are not concerned about the incidence of taxation—where the is, and where the incidence is. All these are merely academic questions.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ The hon. Member wants that it may be called a tax on bus operators.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I have already stated that the amendment is out of order. Hon. Member Sri P. Ramamurthi may now move his amendment.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Sir, I move—

‘ After the words “ on such date ” insert the words “ after the commencement of this Act ” .’

The purpose of my amendment seeks to take away that provision which enables the Government to give retrospective effect to the Bill. As it is, the time when this Bill will come into operation has got to be determined by the Government by a notification and it may be that the Government might notify that this Bill will come into force from the 1st of April 1952. (The Hon. Sri C. Subramanian : ‘ That is not the intention. ’) If that is not the intention let us clarify the position and state very clearly in this sub-clause that this Bill will come into force from the date on which it is actually passed. So this amendment only seeks to clarify the position and can be accepted.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ We have put it as ‘ on such date ’ in order to make it more convenient for people and not to give retrospective effect. It is only intended to give time. I don’t think you need worry about it.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ In view of the assurance given by the Hon. Chief Minister (The Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari : ‘ I may tell the hon. Gentleman that it is not a legal assurance. ’) We are not concerned with any legal assurance on the floor of the House. Now the Hon. Chief Minister and the Hon. Finance Minister have said that the Government have no intention to give any retrospective effect to this Bill from April 1952. That is enough for my purpose. So, I am not pressing my amendment, Sir.”

The amendment of hon. Member Sri P. Ramamurthi, was, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 1 and the preamble were then put and carried.

9th December 1952]

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

‘ That the Madras Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952, be passed into law.’

In so doing, I wish to express my appreciation of the help and co-operation given by every hon. Member of this House. It is true that we might have differences on the necessity for the Bill and we also might have differences on the rate of taxation. We might have differences whether the officers must be protected or not. But, having once agreed to the Bill, I am thankful for the help and co-operation given so far. Hon. Members may have a fear, which they have expressed during the first reading, but which I did not answer at that time and especially hon. Members from South Kanara and some others said that they would support this Bill as long as it was absolutely necessary. Members have raised innumerable difficulties and doubts. I can say only this much, viz., that the Government will keep a very careful watch on this Bill and if we find there were causes for changing it, we shall come before the House for that purpose. I can assure the hon. Members that the idea of this Bill is to get enough money to cover the deficit. That is the only purpose for which we have moved this Bill. So, I request the hon. Members to agree to the passing of this Bill into law without any mental reservation and without any fear about the genuineness of the Government's desire.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Motion moved—

‘ That the Madras Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952, be passed into law.’ ”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I oppose the third reading of this Bill for the following reasons. (Interruption.) What is your motion? (The Hon. Dr. U. Krishna Rao : ‘ That the Bill be passed into law.’) Sir, I think the motion cannot be ‘ that the Bill be passed into law’. I think the more correct procedure is to move that ‘ the third reading of the Bill be passed ’.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ According to our rules, the motion is to be that ‘ the Bill be passed into law.’ We have been following this procedure till now. That is the third reading.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ If that is proper and is also accepted by you, I am opposed to the passing of this Bill into law. I appreciate the spirit in which the Hon. Minister has just said that he appreciated the co-operation received from the Opposition, notwithstanding our differences on the principle of the Bill, on the principle of taxation, on the incidence of taxation, etc. Notwithstanding all these differences, he was pleased to say that we had co-operated and he has made an appreciative reference to us. However, all the sweetness which the Doctor has tried to put under medicated honey will not make this bitterness sweet. I may tell

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [9th December 1952]

the Hon. Minister that on account of the heavy incidence of taxation, a good number of the vehicles are bound to go out of the road.

4-30
p.m.

“ Sir, you will remember that when the original Bill was published, there was an uproar throughout the whole State. It was not merely on the part of the bus operators but also from the passengers. That was because the original Bill was against passengers. Then, Sir, during the Select Committee stage, the incidence was shifted to the bus operators under a wrong understanding because the point was not put up in a concentrated way before the Select Committee by those who came to give evidence who were not aware of the contemplated change in the Bill. It is true that incidentally and casually, we went into the matter. At that time, Sir, there were no lorry operators present and there were only bus operators. The bus operators went on to argue: ‘ Although you ask us to collect the fares from passengers, in effect, we will have to pay the tax from our own pockets because the provisions of the Bill are so complicated that they will not be a workable proposition.’ The press throughout the State also criticised the Bill. We cannot say that the most important and influential newspapers of this State are behind any particular operator or operators. Sir, going through the provisions of the Bill and respecting public opinion at the time, it was good that the Government realised that it was a wrong measure. This was after the Select Committee had sat for two days. Of course, on that day they moved an amendment to the Bill shifting the incidence of taxation to the operator. Then, not content even with this, they brought in the lorry operators also because they wanted to follow the provisions of the Bihar Act. It is all right. But what happened? We objected to the amendment on grounds that the Bill as amended was a new Bill, that the substance of the Bill that was referred to the Select Committee by the Legislature had been changed and that, therefore, the Committee could not proceed with it. Sir, I am speaking not about the technical aspect alone. The real difficulty was that the Select Committee had no opportunity to go into the merits of the new Bill at all. At that time the operators in the State were not in a position to speak out their case except by generally and casually saying that they would not be able to bear the additional burden of taxation. The Government also promised that they would not tax the bus owners. We did not also have the time or feel the necessity to ask for detailed accounts from operators. The question came up again here, Sir, in this House and you were pleased to say just as we said at the time of the sittings of the Select Committee that it was a new Bill and as such had to be reintroduced. We again argued that the Bill had to be referred to a Select Committee since it was a new Bill. The Government were not agreeable to this suggestion. I say, without any fear of contradiction, that this Bill has been rushed through this House. If there is a single instance of a legislation being rushed through on the floor of this House, it is this particular Bill. And now what is the result? The bus

9th December 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

operators are going to be stifled to a great extent. I have taken the House through the accounts rendered by the operators from Visakhapatnam, East Godavari, West Godavari, Krishna, Guntur, Chingleput, Bellary, Kurnool and Salem districts. They have sent their accounts not only to us but I believe to the Hon. the Minister for Transport also. They have given their income and expenditure. I believe that they waited in deputation on the Hon. the Chief Minister and the Hon. the Ministers for Transport and Finance. But what happened? The Government did not heed. The idea that was dominating their mind was bridging the gap between the income and expenditure as disclosed in their Budget Memorandum presented last. Their mind was not particular about analysing or assessing the truth or correctness or otherwise of the figures furnished by the operators. According to their own view, they had the idea of bridging the gap in the Budget and nothing more. Sir, if a Committee was appointed to go into the various items of income and expenditure, we would have shown how to rearrange the whole Budget so that the gap could be filled even under the existing structure of taxation. This Committee, we demanded at the time of the Budget. What did the Government do? They refused even to make enquiries. They refused to appoint a committee of their own, if not a committee of the House. They started with the idea of taxation in the month of June saying: 'Whatever facts may come to light, it does not matter; our idea must be carried out.' It is this idea of the Government that has placed us in this position of opposing the Bill, apart from the fact that this measure will weigh very heavily on the owners of buses and lorries. I am not pleading for any particular owner. I do not know any of the operators. This Bill is sought to bring a revenue of 120 lakhs of rupees to Government from a section of the people who are already burdened with heavy taxation. Under the existing laws, the Government are able to get 387 lakhs of rupees and by this one Bill, they want to increase it by another 120 lakhs of rupees. What is the percentage of this 120 lakhs to the 387 lakhs that they are now paying? Is there a Government, is there a Finance Minister, who has at any time raised a single tax such as this which is nearly 32 per cent of the tax already collected from the same source? The Finance Minister and the Transport Minister are merry because the Bill is going to be passed by the majority they have got in this House. But have they considered whether there is an example of any such increase of nearly 32 per cent by one stroke of the pen? This is indeed too much. I could understand a surcharge, a super-tax, and excess profit-tax and the like which are raised by different slabs at different levels to meet a special emergency. All these facts should have weighed with the Government when they thought of such a measure. The Government must reconsider the matter. It is not yet late because the Bill has got to go before the Council. The Government have time to reconsider the matter. I would certainly like them to give up the entire tax. They can certainly get hold of some other kind of taxation. It is not as if we are touching people who are

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [9th December 1952]

not paying anything now. They are already paying more than 45 per cent of their income to the Government by way of taxes. Therefore, it is not as if the Government have discovered some people who have been evading payment of taxes all these years. Who is there, in this State, except the ryotwari pattadar having four or five acres, paying more than 45 per cent of his gross-income to the Government? Sir, in the other Bill put down for to-day, we are going to impose a further tax on landowners although they are paying more than fifty per cent of their income to the Government."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Do you seriously mean it?"

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I seriously mean it. The ryotwari pattadar has been paying much more than he could. That has been the contention of all persons including Congressmen. They issued pamphlets saying that the incidence is very high. We were saying so at one time. But we seem to forget the same thing when we get into the Government and we do not know now what is wrong and what is right. I can understand a measure like this if it is directed against persons who escape the existing taxes by paying only five or ten per cent of their income. Are the operators the persons on whom the Government should sit tight and say: 'You pay or get out?' If the operators make so much money, why not nationalize transport? Sir, although one Government in 1946-47 made a decision in favour of nationalization, the Government that came subsequently said 'No.' If it is a fact that the bus owners make large profits, then why not the Government, instead of complaining that the owners are making illegal exactions and are not providing necessary amenities to passengers, take over the entire transport system? Let them come forward with a scheme for nationalisation. I am ready and willing to support it provided it makes no discrimination against any. But the Government do not do it. They have good reasons for it because they know that most of these operators are not making profits. In the first days of nationalization they thought that they made lot of profits. But soon after when they took into consideration the real account, after paying the taxes and the licence fees, they found that the nationalized bus transport was not so remunerative as they imagined. From the figures they have got about their transport service, they must be able to calculate the margin of profit made by the private operators. When the margin of profit is so low, I ask, why the Government have not accepted the most modest and reasonable amendment reducing the proposed tax to six pies in the rupee and not keep it at 9 pies? Even the reduction of a quarter anna would be a great thing to the private operators even though the Government may lose only some 15 to 20 lakhs from out of the expected revenue from this taxation. To the ordinary operator it is a great thing. It gives just the margin to enable him to pull on in the occupation. The Government although it is a welfare Government have not formulated schemes

9th December 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

of welfare employment services. They have not formulated schemes for giving educational or medical facilities for all; even minor concessions have not been extended to the poor in the State although they have been able to give to the poor non-gazetted officers some concessions. People of this State must have some employment to carry on. If the Government are not able to find alternative employment for the people, is it right for them to throw out persons already in employment? After all the Government are not able to create occupations for the people or show them other avenues of employment. I submit it is the duty of the Government to provide avenues of employment and see that facilities are provided for private enterprise to carry on their trade as best they can in the public interest, subject of course to regulations that might be made by Government with regard to the amenities they should give to the passengers. On the other hand they are thinking that the bus operators are people who are making piles and piles of money. The other day the Hon. the Chief Minister said in winding up the general debate: 'Here are people who are making tons of money or at any rate have made tons of money'

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I did not say that. But you all said that."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"He says he only quoted what everybody was saying that these operators have made tons of money. Though he did not say it himself, he did not deny or agree with that statement. But the Hon. the Chief Minister at the head of the Government has agreed to tax the private operators on the basis of the alleged profits. The profits alleged to have been made by the operators have been assumed as correct. This is proved by the statement he has made. I say, Sir, it is a wrong assumption on their part. Sir, it was said in the evidence given before the Select Committee that after the slump set in, 60 buses or lorries of a private operator were thrown out of the road. It is a fact. The Hon. Minister knows it. Of course, I appreciate the Government's amendment reducing the tax to nine pies. But what I am saying is that the Government have not understood the seriousness of the position. They are only tinkering with the position by merely reducing it by a quarter of an anna. I am submitting at this stage that the bus operators cannot bear any further taxation. That is my considered opinion which I have formed after looking into the accounts. It is not because I have got any personal interest in any one of these operators. None of them are my relations, none of them are my clients and none of them approached me on this. They sent memoranda to me. I asked them, examined them, cross-examined them on the accounts they produced and I am only proceeding on that basis. I am entitled to take these accounts as correct because fairly under all heads of expenditure and income these figures tally with those shown by Government with regard to their own bus service. Otherwise, I would not

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [9th December 1952]

mention these facts at the risk of repetition. I say the Government have not done well in pursuing with this measure of taxation in such post haste.

“ We have come to the month of December. Only three months are there in the financial year. They are not going to get the amount they expected from out of this taxation because they are not going to give retrospective effect to this legislation. With the revenue they might get out of this taxation they are not going to bridge the gap. Then why should they be anxious to rush through this Bill in this manner without some fact finding as it were with regard to the profits made by the bus operators? After all, these operators are not saying that they are going to pay this tax. It is only a question of their ability to pay under the present circumstances, under the present trade position, the general slump and the general disinclination of the passengers to go by bus if the bus fare is to be increased.

“ There is another point and it is this. It was said: ‘ It is a tax on bus operators and therefore why should you grudge? ’ I submit it is a tax on bus passengers also. In all parallel routes and uneconomic routes where bus operators are now charging less than seven pies the bus operators may raise the fares up to the maximum fixed in this Bill and then it becomes a tax on the passengers. The Government cannot avoid it, because the Bill gives permission to the operators to increase the fares. It is not a tax on passengers only where the operators are already collecting the maximum laid down by the Government. Therefore, I submit, it is not merely a tax on the operators, it is an extra tax on the passengers also. It is these things that we wanted the Government to consider carefully. We thought that the best thing would be to refer the Bill to a Select Committee where these facts could be found. Even now I am submitting as there are only three months more and they cannot collect much revenue in the short period, the Government must postpone notification, and agree to refer this Bill to a fact finding committee to ascertain the real position of the operators. That alone will help the Government and the passengers and the operators will be satisfied that their case has been reasonably heard. The people won't be discontented if after a proper hearing they are taxed although they are not able to pay it. The bus operators and we, members on the Opposition feel that the case has not been heard but the legislation is being rushed through. That is why I am opposed to the passing of this Bill.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I am fixing a time limit of ten minutes. The hon. Member Mr. Govindaswami Naicker will now speak.”

* SRI A. GOVINDASWAMI NAYAGAR :—“ கனம் தலைவர் அவர்களே, பஸ் பிரயாணிகள் மீது போடுகின்ற இந்த வரியை நான் எதிர்த்துப் பேசுகின்றேன். இந்த வரியானது ‘ பஸ் முதலாளிகளின் மீது தானே போடப் படுகிறது ; ஆனால், பிரயாணிகளின் மீது போடப்படவில்லையே ’ என்று முதல் மந்திரி அவர்களும் அவரைச் சார்ந்திருக்கிற தொழில் மந்திரி அவர்களும், நிதி மந்திரி அவர்களும் அடிக்கடி சொல்லி வருகின்றார்கள். இது எப்படி

9th December 1952]

[Sri A. Govindaswami Nayagar]

இருக்கிறதென்றால், விற்பனை வரி போட்ட காலத்திலே 'கடைக்காரர்கள் தானே இந்த வரியைக் கொடுக்கின்றார்கள்; வாங்குபவர்கள் பாதிக்கப்படவில்லையே' என்று வாங்குவோர்களிடம் சொன்னார்கள். கடைக்காரர்களிடம் போய் 'யார் சரக்கு வாங்குகிறார்களோ, அவர்கள் தானே இந்த வரியைத் தாங்குகிறார்கள், நீங்கள் ஏன் கஷ்டப்படுகிறீர்கள்?' என்று இதே முதல் மத்திரியார் அப்பொழுது விற்பனைவரி கொண்டு வந்த காலத்திலே கூறினார்கள். அதே முறையிலே இப்பொழுது இந்த வரியைக் கொண்டுவந்து, 'இந்த வரியானது பிரயாணிகளைப் பாதிக்கவில்லை, பஸ் சொந்தக் காரர்களைத்தான் பாதிக்கிறது' என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். இது எப்படியிருக்கிறதென்றால், கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் 'பூனைக்குத் தோழனாகவும், எலிக்குச் சேவகனாகவும் இருக்கிறதுபோல், இருக்கிறதென்று சொல்லிக்கொள்ள ஆசைப்படுகிறேன். அதாவது, பூனையையும் எலியையும் பக்கத்திலே வைத்துக்கொண்டு, 'பூனைகளை நீங்கள் பயப்படாதீர்கள், உங்களுக்கு நல்ல ஆகாரம் இருக்கிறது' என்று சொல்லிக்கொண்டு, 'எலிகளே, உங்களுடைய உயிருக்கு அபாயம் ஒன்றுமில்லை' என்று சொல்வது எப்படியோ அதேபோல்தான் இருக்கிறது. இந்த பஸ் பிரயாணிகளைப்பார்த்து, 'இந்த வரியானது உங்களுக்கு இல்லை, பஸ் முதலாளிகளுக்குத்தான்' என்று சொல்வதும், பஸ் முதலாளிகளைப்பார்த்து 'இது பிரயாணிகளைத்தானே பாதிக்கிறது. உங்களுக்கு என்ன கஷ்டம்' என்றும் கேட்கிறார்கள். இது சரியான வாதம் அல்ல என்பதை கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்களுக்கும் அவரைச் சார்ந்தவர்களுக்கும் சொல்லிக்கொள்ள ஆசைப்படுகிறேன்.

"கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் சொன்னார்கள்: இந்த வரியைக் கம்ப்யூனிஸ்டுக் கட்சிக்காரர்கள் எதிர்க்கிறார்கள், எதிர்க்கட்சிக் காரர்கள் எந்த வரியையும் எதிர்க்கவே இருக்கின்றார்கள் என்று சொன்னார்கள். கம்ப்யூனிஸ்டுக் கட்சிக்காரர்கள் மட்டும்தான் இந்த வரியை எதிர்க்கவில்லை. பொதுஜனங்களிடத்தில் தொடர்பு கொண்ட எல்லா கட்சியும் எதிர்க்கும். ஜனநாயக உணர்ச்சி கொண்டிருக்கிற யாவரும் இந்த வரியை எதிரிக்கத்தான் செய்வார்கள். பொது மக்களின் மீது வரி போடும்போது, அந்த பொதுமக்களுக்கு ஏதாவது நல்ல காரியம் செய்யக்கூடியதாக இருக்கவேண்டும். இந்த வரியானது அந்த முறையில் ஜனங்களுக்கு நல்லதை செய்யக்கூடியதாக இல்லை. ஆகவே தான், உழைப்பாளிகள் கட்சியைச் சேர்ந்த நானும் இந்த வரியை எதிரிக்கின்றேன்.

"எங்களுடைய கட்சி ஒட்டுக் கட்சியென்றும், hotch-potch என்றும் கூறியிருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால், இன்றையதினம் ஆட்சியிலே இருக்கின்ற காங்கிரஸ் கட்சியும் கதம்பக் கட்சியாக இருந்துகொண்டிருப்பது உங்களுக்கு நன்றாகத் தெரியும். அந்தக் கட்சியிலே இன்றைக்கு காமன்வீல் கட்சியும் முஸ்லீம் லீக் கட்சியும் சேர்ந்துகொண்டிருக்கின்றன. கே. எல். பி. என்ற ரங்கா கட்சியும் அதனுடன் சேர்ந்து இருந்து இன்றையதினம் காங்கிரசை விட்டு கிழித்துக் கொண்டு இந்தப் பக்கத்திற்கு வந்துகொண்டிருக்கிறது என்று இந்த சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் சொல்லிக்கொள்ள ஆசைப்படுகிறேன். எதிர்க்கட்சி ஒட்டுக் கட்சியாக இருக்கிறது என்று கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் சொல்வது தவறு என்பதற்காகத்தான் இதையெல்லாம் சொல்ல வேண்டியிருக்கிறது.

"அவர்கள் சொல்லலாம், 'நீங்கள் எதிர்க்கட்சிக்காரர்கள், அதனால், எதையும் நீங்கள் எதிர்க்கின்றீர்கள்' என்று நான் அவர்களைக் கேட்கின்றேன். கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுக்கு பாதுகாப்பு அளிக்க தீர்மானம் கொண்டுவந்தபோது நாங்கள் ஏகமனதாக அதை ஆதரித்தோம். அடுத்தபடியாக, தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள குடியானவர்களுக்கு நன்மை செய்யக்கூடிய விவசாயி பண்ணையாள் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டத்தை நாங்கள் எதிர்த்தோமா? அதையும் ஏகமனதாக ஒத்துக்கொண்ட காலத்தில், எதிர்க்கட்சியாகிய நாங்கள் சொல்வதை நீங்கள் ஏன் ஒத்துக்கொள்ள மறுக்கின்றீர்கள்? இந்த வரியானது பொதுமக்களுக்கு நல்லதல்ல என்று எதிர்க்கட்சியாகிய நாங்கள் சொல்லும்போது, 'எதிர்க்கட்சிக்காரர்கள் இப்படிச் சொல்லு

4-50
p.m.

[Sri A. Govindaswami Nayagar] [9th December 1952]

கிளர்கள், அதனால் நாங்கள் ஒத்துக்கொள்ளமாட்டோம்' என்று நினைத்து நாங்கள் சொல்லும் ஒரு நல்ல காரியத்தையேனும் நீங்கள் ஒத்துக்கொள்ள மறுக்கிறீர்கள். ஆகவே தான் இதையெல்லாம் நான் சொல்லக் கடமைப்பட்டிருக்கிறேன்.

“இன்றையதினம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் பஸ் காரர்களுக்கு உடந்தையாக இருக்கிறார்கள் என்று ஓரளவுக்குச் சொல்லலாம், அவர்களுக்கு சமாதானம் சொல்லும்போது. ஆனால், இது பஸ் காரர்களையும் பாதிக்கின்றது என்று தான் நான் சொல்லிக் கொள்ள ஆசைப்படுகின்றேன். குறிப்பாக, சென்னையிலிருந்து செங்கற்பட்டுக்குப் போகவேண்டுமானால், இப்பொழுது பஸ்காரர்கள் ஒரு ரூபாய் பஸ் சார்ஜ் வசூலிக்கிறார்கள். ஒரு மைலுக்கு 6 பைசா என்ற விகிதத்தில் இப்பொழுது வாங்கிக்கொண்டு இருக்கிறார்கள். சட்டத்தில் மைலுக்கு 7 பைசா வரையில் பிரயாணிகளிடமிருந்து வசூலிக்கலாம் என்று இருந்தும் கூட அவர்கள் 6 பைசாதான் வாங்குகிறார்கள். ஆனால், இந்த வரியானது அமுலுக்கு வரும்போது, மைலுக்கு 7 பைசா வீதம் பஸ் முதலாளிகள் வசூலிக்கத் தயங்கமாட்டார்கள். அதாவது சென்னையிலிருந்து செங்கற்பட்டுக்குச் செல்வதற்கு ஏற்கனவே ஒரு ரூபாய் (1-0-0) வாங்கிக்கொண்டிருந்தவர்கள், இந்த வரியானது அமுலுக்கு வரும்போது ரூ. 1-3-0 வாங்குவார்கள். அதாவது ஏற்கனவே வந்துகொண்டிருந்த ஒரு ரூபாய் பஸ்காரர்களுக்கு கிடைத்து விடுகின்றது. 9 பைசாவை சர்க்காருக்கு கொடுத்துவிடுகிறார்கள். 0-2-3ஐ யும் பஸ் முதலாளிகள் எடுத்துக் கொள்ளுகிறார்கள். இதுதரப்பிலும் பஸ் முதலாளிகளுக்குப் பணம் வருகிறதென்று சொன்னாலும், என் இதை பஸ் சொந்தக்காரர்கள் எதிர்க்கின்றார்கள்? சட்டப் பிரகாரம் மைலுக்கு 7 பைசா வரையில் வாங்கலாம் என்று இருந்தாலும், மைலுக்கு 6 பைசா தான் பஸ் சொந்தக்காரர்கள் வாங்குகிறார்கள் என்று சொன்னால், பொதுமக்கள்மீது பஸ் சொந்தக் காரர்களுக்குக் கருணை பிறந்துவிடவில்லை. பொதுமக்கள்மீது அவர்களுக்குக் கருணை கொஞ்சமும் இல்லை. மைலுக்கு 7 பைசா என்று போட்டால், அதிகமான பேர்கள் பஸ்வசில் பிரயாணம் செய்ய வரமாட்டார்கள். ஆகையால், அவர்களுடைய வருமானம் குறைந்து விடும், என்பதற்காகத்தான் 7 பைசா வீதம் வசூலிக்காமல் இருக்கிறார்களேயொழிய எதோ பஸ் பிரயாணிகள் து கருணை பிறந்துவிட்டது என்பதற்காக அல்ல. பக்கத்தில் ரயில் ஓடிக்கொண்டிருக்கிறது. அப்படி இருக்கும்போது, குறைந்த சாஜ் வசூல் செய்தால்தான் பஸ்வசில் பிரயாணம் செய்வதற்கு அதிகமான பேர்கள் வருவார்கள், அப்பொழுது தான் தங்களுக்கு வருமானம் வரும் என்று பஸ் முதலாளிகள் சட்டத்தில் 7 பைசா வசூலிக்கலாமென்று இருந்தாலும், 6 பைசாதான், ரயில் பாதை சமீபத்தில் இருக்கின்ற இடங்களில் வசூலிக்கின்றார்கள். ரயில் போகாத இடங்களில் அவர்கள் அதிக சார்ஜ் வாங்கிக் கொண்டு வருவதும் சர்க்காருக்கு நன்கு தெரியும். ஆனால், சென்னையிலிருந்து செங்கற்பட்டு, திண்டிவனம் போன்ற இடங்களுக்குப் போகும்போது சார்ஜைக் குறைக்கவேண்டியிருக்கிறது. குறிப்பாக சொல்லவேண்டுமானால் 20 பேர்கள் இப்பொழுது பிரயாணம் செய்கிறார்கள் என்று சொன்னால், இந்தப் புதிய வரி போட்டால் மைலுக்கு 7 பைசா வீதம் வசூலிப்பதால், பஸ்காரர்களுக்கு 6 ரூபாய் குறைந்து விடும். ஆனால் நபருக்கு 0-2-3 லாபம். ஏனென்றால் ஒரு பிரயாணத்திற்கு 5, 6 பிரயாணிகள் குறைந்துவிடுவார்கள். தங்கள் சார்பாக 0-2-3 அதிகப்படி வருமானத்தின்மூலமாக 2-1-3 லாபம் வருகிறது. ஆகவே, கிட்டத்தட்ட பஸ்காரர்களுக்கு ஒரு டிரிப்புக்கு 4 ரூபாய் குறைகிறது. அதனால்தான் அவர்கள் இதை எதிர்க்கவேண்டிய நிலைமையில் இருக்கிறார்கள். ஆகவேதான் பஸ் சொந்தக்காரர்கள் இதனால் பாதிக்கப்படுகிறார்கள் என்று சொல்லவேண்டியது அவசியமாக இருக்கிறது.

“யுத்தம் ஏற்படுவதற்கு முன்பு spare parts அதிக விலை வில்லை. இப்பொழுது ஒன்றுக்கு நான்கு மடங்காக விலை ஏறியிருக்கிறது. பெட்ரோல் விலையும் ஏறியிருக்கிறது. இன்றைய தினம் பஸ் சொந்தக்காரர்களெல்லாம் மார்வாடிக்கையில் C Certificate-ஐ அடகு வைத்துக்கொண்டு இருக்கிறார்கள் என்பது உங்களுக்குத் தெரியும். கல்கட்டரிமோ, அந்தந்த

9th December 1952]

[Sri A. Govindaswami Nayagar]

ஜில்லா ரூப்பெண்டெண்ட் அவர்களிடமோ நீங்கள் கடிதம் எழுதிக்கேட்டால் உங்களுக்குத் தகவல் வந்துவிடும். சென்னை மாகாணத்தில் சௌகார் களிடம் அடித் வைக்காத பஸ் சொந்தக்காரர்கள் இருக்கவே இருக்கமாட்டார்கள். அப்படி யாராவது இருக்கிறார்களென்று சொன்னால், அது சிம்சன் கம்பெனி, டி.வி.எஸ். போன்ற பஸ் முதலாளிகள் இருக்கலாமே தவிர, 1, 2 பஸ் வைத்துக் கொண்டிருப்பவர்களும், இன்னும் fleet owners என்று சொல்பவர்கள் கூட கடன்பட்டுக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். எவ்வளவு வட்டி கொடுக்கிறார்கள் தெரியுமா? இவ்வளவு இந்த நாட்டைச் சுற்றி வதற்கென்றே இருக்கின்றவர்கள் 36 % வட்டி வாங்குகின்றார்கள். இந்த சர்க்கார் அவர்களுக்கு உடந்தையாக இருக்கிறது என்று சொல்லிக்கொள்ள ஆசைப்படுகிறேன். 36 % வட்டி மார்வாடிகள் வாங்குகிறார்களென்றால், இது சர்க்காருக்குத் தெரியாதது அல்ல. அவர்களுக்குத் தெரிந்திருக்கிறது. மார்வாடிகள் இப்படி அநியாயமாக வட்டி வாங்குவது தெரிந்தும், அப்படி அதிக வட்டி வாங்குவதைத் தடுப்பதற்கு இந்த சர்க்கார் எந்த நடவடிக்கையும் எடுக்கவில்லை. 36% மார்வாடிகளுக்கு வட்டியைக் கொடுக்கக்கூடியவர்களுக்கு லாபம் இல்லாமலா இருக்கும் என்று கேட்கலாம். வேறு யாரும் பணம் கொடுக்கத் தயாராயில்லை. அந்த காரணத்திற்காகத்தான் மார்வாடியிடம் 36 % வட்டிக்காவது கடன் வாங்குகிறார்கள். அவர்கள் அந்த நிலைமையில் இருக்கிறார்கள். சர்க்காரே முன்வந்து 24 %க்கு கடன் கொடுப்பதாயிருந்தாலும் பஸ் முதலாளிகள் கடன் வாங்கிக்கொண்டு தொழிலை நடத்தத் தயாராயிருக்கிறார்கள். சர்க்கார் அப்படித் கடன் கொடுக்க முன்வருமா என்றால் அவர்கள் முன் வரமாட்டார்கள்.

‘நாங்கள் தேசியமயமாக்கப் போகிறோம் என்று சொன்னார்களே, இந்த பஸ் நடத்துவதை தேசிய மயமாக்கக்கூடாதா? என்று கேட்கின்றேன். சென்னை நகரத்தில் சர்க்கார் பஸ் ஸர்வீசை நடத்துகிறார்கள். அதனால், அதிக லாபம் வருகிறது என்று சென்னை சர்க்காருக்குத் தெரிந்தும் கூட ஏன் இதுவரையில் மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களுக்கும் அதை விலஸ்தரிக்க வில்லையென்று கேட்கிறேன். நீங்கள் விலஸ்தரிக்கத் தயாராயிருந்தால் பஸ் முதலாளிகளுக்கு இருக்குத் தொல்லைகளையெல்லாம் விட்டு விட்டு, பஸ்களை சர்க்காருக்கு விற்றுவிட்டுப்போகத் தயாராய் இருக்கிறார்கள்.

“இன்றைய தினம் காங்கிரஸ் தரப்பில் பஸ் முதலாளிகள் அதிகம் இருக்கிறார்கள், எதற்காக காங்கிரஸிலே வந்தார்கள்? அதிக ரூபிடைக்கு மென்று வந்தார்கள். வந்த இடத்தில் இடிவிழுந்த மாதிரி வரி போட்டு வருமானம் குறைக்கப்படுகிறது என்று கவனித்துக்கொண்டு, தாங்கள் பேச முடியாது என்ற காரணத்திற்காக, ‘நீங்கள் எடுத்துத் தாக்கப் பேசுங்கள், வரியைத் தடுத்துப் பேசுங்கள்’ என்றுகிறார்கள். தாங்கள் என்ன பண்ணுவது என்று அவர்களுக்குத் தெரியவில்லை. அவர்களுக்கு சுற்றறிக்கை போகிறது. சர்க்கார் whip-ஐப் பார்க்கும்போதும், நிதி மந்திரியைப் பார்க்கும்போதும் அவர்கள் தங்களுடைய கருத்தைச் சொல்ல முடியாமலிருக்கிறார்கள். இந்த வரியை எதிர்க்க வேண்டுமென்று எண்ணம் இருக்கிறது. இருந்தாலுங்கூட வேறு வழியில்லாமல் ஆதரிக்கவேண்டிய நிலைமையில் அங்கே இருக்கின்ற பஸ் முதலாளிகள் இன்றைய தினம் இருக்கின்றார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு உள்ளபடியே இந்த வரியை ஆதரிக்க வேண்டுமென்று எண்ணம் இல்லை. அவர்கள் செய்த பாவத்தை தான் இப்பொழுது அவர்கள் அனுபவிக்கின்றார்கள்.

“கடந்த தேர்தலில் பஸ் முதலாளிகள் அத்தனை பேரும் தங்களுடைய கார்களைக் காங்கிரசுக்குக் கொடுத்திருந்தார்கள். பெட்ரோல் கொடுத்திருந்தார்கள் அனைக காங்கிரஸ்காரர்கள் இன்று பஸ் முதலாளிகளுக்கு உடந்தையாக இருக்கிறார்கள். இந்த வரியானது பஸ் முதலாளிகளையும் பாதிக்கின்றது. சாதாரண பிரயாணிகளையும் பாதிக்கின்றது.

“நான் ஒரு கிராமத்திலிருந்து வந்தவன். அவர்களுடைய கஷ்டங்கள் எனக்குத் தெரியும். ஒரு ஊரிலிருந்து மற்றொரு ஊருக்கு அவசரமாக போக

[Sri A. Govindaswami Nayagar]

[9th December 1952]

வேண்டுமானால்தான் அவர்கள் பஸ்விலி போவார்கள். அதற்கு ரூ. 0-6-0 சார்ஜ் என்றால், முந்தாணியில் முடிந்து வைத்துக்கொண்டிருந்த ரூ. 0-4-6 பணத்தை எடுத்துக் கண்டக்டரிடம் கொடுக்கும்போது, சார்ஜ் ரூ. 0-6-0 என்று கண்டக்டர் சொன்னால், அவர்களால் ஒன்றும் செய்ய முடியாது. ரூ. 0-1-6 கொடுத்தால்தான் பஸ்விலி போகலாம் என்று கண்டக்டர் சொல்லுவான். ஆனால், அந்தப் பிரயாணியிடம் 4½ அணுவுக்கு மேல் பணம் இருக்காது. கொடுக்கமுடியாமல் திண்டாடுவான். ‘1½ அணுவும் கொடுத்தால் பஸ்விலி போகலாம், இல்லாவிட்டால் கீமே இறங்கிவிடு’ என்று கண்டக்டர் சொல்லும் போது வேறு வழியில்லாமல் அவன் பஸ்ஸை விட்டு இறங்கி, நடந்து செல்ல வேண்டிய நிலைமையில் இருப்பான் அவ்விதமே மற்றவர்களும் இருக்கிறார்கள். அவன் ஒரு அவசியமான காரியத்திற்காகப் போக வேண்டியிருக்கும். ஆனால், வழியிலே இம்மாதிரி தடைப்பட்டு அவன் அந்தக் காரியத்தைக் கவனிக்க முடியாமல் போகிறது. இந்த நிலையில் பிரயாணிகள் கஷ்டப்பட்டுக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அப்படி இந்த வரியானது ஏழைகளைப் பாதிக்கும்போது, இது ஏழைகளை பாதிக்கவில்லையென்று சொல்ல முடியுமா? ‘ஏன் ஏழைகளைல்லாம் பஸ்விலி போக வேண்டும்?’ என்று முதல் மந்திரி கேட்கிறார். நடந்து சென்றால் உடலுக்கு வலுவாக இருக்கும்மே, நடந்து செல்லலாமே என்று அவர் சொல்லலாம். இவர்கள் நடந்து போனால் கஷ்டங்கள் தெரியும் என்று நான் சொல்லுகின்றேன். இவர்களுக்கு மட்டும் கார்டும் இன்னும் பல சென்கரியங்களும் வேண்டும். நாங்கள் சுதந்தர வீரர்கள் என்று சொன்ன வர்களுக்கெல்லாம் இன்று உல்லாசப் பிரயாணம் செய்வதற்கு புதிய புதிய கார்ட்கள் வேண்டியிருக்கிறது. ஆனால், ஏழைகள் மட்டும் பஸ்விலி செல்வதற்குக்கூட மேலும் மேலும் வரி போடுவதென்றால் அதை என்னவென்று சொல்வது? பஸ்விலி செல்வது இன்றைய நகரீக மாக இருக்கிறது. ஒரு ஊரிலிருந்து இன்னொரு ஊருக்கு அவசியமான காரியங்களுக்காக சாதாரண குடியானவர்களும், கிராமத்தில் விவசாயம் செய்வதில் சிறிய விவசாயிகளும், இன்னும் வியாபாரம் செய்பவர்களும் தான் பஸ்விலிப் பிரயாணம் செய்ய வேண்டியிருக்கிறது. அப்படிப்பட்டவர்களுக்கு அதிக வரி போட்டால் அது எந்த விதத்தில் நியாயம் என்பதை என்னால் புரிந்துகொள்ள முடியவில்லை.

“இந்த நிலையிலே நான் சொல்லுகிறேன். பஸ்விலே பிரயாணம் செய்கின்றவர்களைத்தான் இந்த வரியானது வெகுவாக பாதிக்கிறது. அந்த நிலையிலே அவர்களுடைய தொழிலைப் பாதிக்கிறது என்றும், பஸ் முதலாளிகளையும் இது பாதிக்கின்ற காரணத்தால்தான் அவர்களும் இதை எதிர்க்கின்றார்கள் என்றும் நான் தெரிவித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். காங்கிரஸ் தரப்பில் இருக்கின்றவர்கள் பலர் பஸ் முதலாளிகளின் (பொது மக்கள்) வோட்டைப் பெற்று வந்திருக்கிறார்கள். இந்த வரிக்கு சாதகமாக அவர்கள் வோட்டு செய்வார்களேயானால் அவர்களுடைய தொகுதிக்குப் போக முடியுமா? பொது மக்களுடைய கேள்விகளுக்கு அவர்கள் பதில் சொல்லியாக வேண்டியிருக்கும். ‘மொழி பெயர்ப்பு வேண்டுமென்ற தீர்மானத்தை நான் ஆதரிக்கிறேன்; ஆனால், வோட்டுப் போடும்போது, தீர்மானத்தை எதிர்த்து வோட்டு செய்வேன்’ என்று ஒரு அங்கத்தினர் சொன்ன மாதிரி, அந்த நிலைமையிலே இன்றைய தினம் காங்கிரஸில் பஸ் காரர்கள் அங்கே இருந்து கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். பொது - மக்களிடம் வோட்டு பெற்று வந்தவர்கள், இன்று இந்த வரிக்கு ஆதரவாக வோட்டுப் போட்டால், அவர்களுக்குக் கொடுத்திருக்கும் வாக்குறுதி என்ன ஆவது? பொது மக்களை பாதிக்கக்கூடிய வகையில் இந்த வரி இருப்பதால், அதை எதிர்க்கிறேன். பஸ் முதலாளிகளுக்கு பாதகமாக இருப்பதால் இதை எதிர்க்கிறேன். ஆனால், இந்த வரியை ஆதரிக்கிறேன் என்று சொல்லக் கூடிய நிலைமையில் இருக்கும், அவர்கள் இந்த வரிக்கு வோட்டு செய்வார்களேயானால், பஸ் முதலாளிகளுக்கு லாபம் இருக்குமேயானால், அவர்கள் ஒத்தாசையாக இருக்க முடியும். ஆனால் அவர்களுக்கும் லாபம் இல்லை. பொது மக்களையும் இது பாதிக்கின்ற காரணத்திற்காக, தொகுதியிலுள்ள மக்கள் கேள்வி கேட்பார்கள் என்ற காரணத்திற்காக இதை நான் எதிர்க்கின்றேன்.

9th December 1952]

[Sri A. Govindaswami Nayagar]

“ பஸ் முதலாளிகளுக்கு ஆதரவு கொடுத்தது நிற்கல்தான். அவர்களுக்கும் காங்கிரசுக்கும் எந்தவிதமான சம்பந்தமும் இல்லை. சரிந்துவிட்ட காங்கிரசை சரிக்கட்டுவதற்காக பஸ் முதலாளிகளும் இதில் சேர்ந்திருக்கிறார்கள். அதனால்தான் அவர்கள் எதிர்க்கின்றார்கள்.”

*SRI P. JEEVANANDAM :—“ கனம் தலைவர் அவர்களே! இப்பொழுது நம் முன்னால் இருக்கக்கூடிய இந்த மசோதாவைப் பொருத்த வரையில் இது எத்தனையோ எதிர்ப்பு நிலையில் இருக்கிறது, என்பதிலே இந்த மறைத்தில் அத்தனை அங்கத்தினர்களும் பேசியபிறகு பன்னிப் பன்னி நான் மறுபடியும் பேசவேண்டும் என்று நினைக்கவில்லை. முதலிலேயே ஒரு மசோதாவைக் கொண்டுவந்து அது தனிக்கமிட்டியில் தோற்கடிக்கப்பட்டு பின்னால் வேறு ரூபத்தில் அதைக்கொண்டு வருவதிலிருந்தே சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலேயே இந்த சட்டத்திற்கு ஆதரவு இல்லை என்பதும் இந்த வரி போடுவதற்கு ஆதரவு இல்லை என்பதும் வெளிப்படையாக இருக்கிறது.”

SRI K. RAJARAM NAIDU :—“ இது தனிக் கமிட்டியில் தோற்கடிக்கப் படவில்லை.”

*SRI P. JEEVANANDAM :—“ செலக்ட் கமிட்டியில் தோற்கடிக்கப் படவில்லை என்று சர்க்கார் தரப்பில் கூறப்படுகிறது. தனிக் கமிட்டியில் தோற்கடிக்கப்பட வில்லையானால் புதிய ‘பில்’ கொண்டுவரவேண்டிய அவசியமிராது. இது சாதாரணமாக பொதுப்படையாக எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். ஆகவே இந்த வரி மிகவும் சிக்கலான நிலைமையில் கொண்டு வரப்படுகிறது என்பதைப் பார்க்கவேண்டும். இது ஒன்று.”

“ இரண்டாவதாக புதிய வரிகள் போடுவது அவசியம் என்று எதிர் தரப்பிலிருப்பவர்கள் ஏற்கனவே பட்ஜெட் விவாதத்தில் கூறி இருக்கிறோம். புதிய வரி போடாமலேயே இந்த பட்ஜெட்டை சரிக்கட்ட முடியும் என்று சொன்ன யோசனையை சர்க்கார் வாங்கிக்கொள்ளவில்லை. புதிய வரி போட்டால், துண்டுவிழக்கூடிய நாலு கோடி ரூபாயை சரிக்கட்ட முடியும் என்று கூறிக்கொண்டு வந்தார்கள். இந்த நாலு கோடி ரூபாயல்ல இப்பொழுது பத்து கோடி ரூபாய் துண்டுவிழும் என்று கூட சொல்லப்படுகிறது. அந்த நிலைமைக்கு இப்பொழுது அரசாங்கம் வந்திருக்கிறது. இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை நிறைவேற்றி வைக்கும் முன்பாக இன்னும் எத்தனை கோடி ரூபாய் துண்டு விழுமோ என்பதைப்பற்றி யோசிக்கவேண்டும். நாட்டில் பொருளாதார நெரக்கடி ஆழமாக இருக்கிறது என்பதை உணரவேண்டும். இதைச் சரிக்கட்டுவதற்கு சர்க்கார் முயற்சிக்கவேண்டும். இதைச் சரிக்கட்டுவதற்கு யாரால் கொடுக்கமுடியாதோ அவர்களிடத்தில் மேலும் மேலும் வரியை சுமத்த முயற்சித்தால் அது பலன் தராது. இதை சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலிருப்பவர்கள் பார்க்கவில்லை. நாட்டில் பணம் இருக்கிறது. இன்றைக்கு சர்க்காருக்கு ஏற்பட்டிருக்கும் வரவு செலவு திட்டத்தில் துண்டு விழுவதை சரிக்கட்டுவதற்கு ஜனப் பகுதியில் மக்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களிடத்தில் செல்வதற்கு சர்க்கார் தயாராக இல்லை. ஏற்கனவே இருக்கும் வரி பளுவையே தாள் முடியவில்லையே என்று பொதுமக்கள் சொல்லுகிறார்கள். பல மந்திரிகள் சுற்றுப் பிரயாணம் செய்தபோது அவர்களிடத்தில் மக்கள் என்ன சொன்னார்கள்? கவர்னர் அவர்களுடைய சுற்றுப் பிரயாணத்தில் மக்கள் என்ன சொல்லி இருக்கிறார்கள்? எங்கு சென்றாலும் இந்த வரிக் கொடுமை தான் முடியவில்லையே என்று புதிய வரிகள் போடாதீர்கள் என்றும் மக்கள் வாய்விட்டு சொல்லி இருக்கிறார்கள். அவ்வித நிலைமை இருக்கும்போது புது வரி போட்டு துண்டு விழுவதை சரிக்கட்டுவது என்றிருந்தால் அதில் நடைமுறையில் வெற்றி கிடைக்குமா என்பதை சர்க்கார் யோசிக்கவேண்டும். இதை எவ்விதம் ஒப்புக்கொள்ளமுடியும்? சர்க்காருக்கு இங்கு மெஜாரிட்டி கிடைக்கலாம். இங்கு மெஜாரிட்டி பெற்றுவிட்டால் அது மக்களின் அபிப்பிராயத்தைப் பெறுவது என்பதில்லை. இது, ஒரு கருத்துக்கு இங்கு மெஜாரிட்டி பெறுவது என்ற விஷயம் அல்ல. ரூபாய், அணு, பைசா விஷயம் இது. மக்களிடம் வரிமூலம் ரூபாய், அணு, பைசா, பெரும் விஷயம் என்பதைப் பார்க்கவேண்டும். முன்பு விற்பனை வரிமூலம் 16½ கோடி கிடைத்தது.

[Sri P. Jeevanandam]

[9th December 1952]

பின்னர் பட்ஜெட் கூட்டத்தின்போது 14½ கோடி ரூபாய் வருமானம் வரும் என்று கணக்குப் போடப்பட்டது. ஆனால் இப்பொழுது அதுவும் குறைந்து விட்டது என்கிறார்கள். ஏன்? மக்களிடத்தில் வாங்கும் சக்தி குறைந்துவிட்டது. அதனால்தான் துண்டு விழுவது அதிகமாகி வருகிறது. நிலைமை இவ்விதம் இருக்கும்போது எவ்விதம் புதிய வரியைப் பெறமுடியும். இருசி மஞ்சளாகி, மஞ்சள் உள்வரியாகி, உள்வி உள்ளே போய்விட்டது என்பதை உணர்ந்து பார்க்க வேண்டும். இப்பொழுது பொருளாதார நிலைமை அவ்விதம் இருக்கிறது. நெருக்கடி ஆறாமான நிலைமைக்கு வந்திருக்கிறது என்பதைக் குறிப்பிட விரும்புகிறேன். துண்டு விழுவதை சரிக்கட்டுவதற்கு இதைக் கொண்டுவரப்பட்டிருக்கிறது என்று சொல்லப்படுகிறது. இந்த புதிய வரியை நிறைவேற்றியே தீருவோம் என்று சர்க்கார் தரப்பில் பிடிவாதம் காட்டப்படுகிறது. யதார்த்த நிலையை உணர்ந்து பார்க்கவேண்டும். அரசியல் கண்ணோட்டத்துடன் எதிர்க்கட்சியினர் இந்தச் சட்டத்தை எதிர்க்கிறார்கள் என்று சொல்லலாம். ஆனால் கடலூரில் 25, 30 பஸ்களை வைத்துக் கொண்டிருக்கும் காங்கிரஸ் பாஷ்யம் ரெட்டியார் இந்த வரிபளுவை தன்னால் தாங்கமுடியாது என்றும் இனி மேல் வரி கட்டமுடியாது என்றும் சர்க்கார் வேண்டுமானால் பஸ்களை எடுத்துக் கொள்ளட்டும் என்றும் சொல்லுகிறார். காங்கிரஸ் தரப்பிலே பஸ் இதை எதிர்க்கிறார்கள். கனம் கோவிந்தசாமி நாயகர் சொன்னமாதிரி காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களே எங்களிடம் வந்து இதை எதிர்த்துப் பேசுங்கள் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். காங்கிரஸ் எம்.எல்.ஏ.கள் கூட சொல்லுகிறார்கள். நாங்கள் அழிந்து விடுவோம். நீங்களாவது இதை எதிர்த்துப் பேசுங்கள் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். இன்றைக்கு பஸ்காரர்கள் எப்படி இருக்கிறார்கள். என்பதைப் பார்க்க வேண்டும். அவர்களுக்கு வருவாயே இல்லை. தொழிலை விட்டுவிடவேண்டிய நிலையில் இருக்கிறது என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். இதை யதார்த்தமாகப் பார்க்கவேண்டும். இந்த வரி போட்டால் அது நடைமுறையில் வெற்றி பெறுமா என்பதைப் பார்க்கவேண்டும். மிகப் பெரு முதலாளியான டி.வி.எஸ். செழிப்படைந்ததுக் கொண்டு இருக்கிறார்கள். எஸ். ஆர். வி. எஸ். செழிப்படைந்திருக்கிறார்கள். 2 பஸ், 5 பஸ், 10 பஸ் வைத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கும் இடையீட்டு முதலாளிகள் மிகவும் நஷ்டமடைந்திருக்கிறார்கள். உண்மையான பெரிய பஸ் முதலாளிகள் சவுக்கார்ப்பேட்டையில் இருக்கிறார்கள். பேரளவில் முதலாளிகளே. சிறு சிறு பஸ் முதலாளிகள் மானமாக வாழ தங்களுடைய கார்களையெல்லாம் அடகு வைத்திருக்கிறார்கள். எல்லா முதலாளிகளும் இப்பொழுது கடன் வாங்கிக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். சின்ன முதலாளிகள் பேருக்குத்தான் இருக்கிறார்கள். உண்மையான முதலாளிகள் சவுக்கார்ப்பேட்டையில் இருக்கிறார்கள் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். கடன் வாங்கிக்கொண்டு இருக்கக்கூடத்தான் தாங்கள் முதலாளிகளாக இருக்கிறோம் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். அவர்களெல்லோரும் தீவாலாகிவிட்டார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு வரி போட்டால் பிரயாணிகளுக்குத்தான் அந்த பளு ஏற்படும். இத்தகைய பஸ் முதலாளிகளுக்கு மேலும் புதிய வரியைச் சமத்தத் துணி கிறது சர்க்கார். அது எப்படி அமுலுக்கு வரும்? அமுலுக்கு வந்தால் அது என்னவாகும்? 5, 6 பஸ்களை வைத்துக்கொண்டிருப்பவர்கள் செழிப்புற்ற நிலையிலிருக்கிறார்கள். இந்த வரியினால் அவர்கள் நொடித்துப் போவார்கள். பஸ்கள் ஓடுவதற்கு முடியாமல் போகும். முதலாளிகள் பஸ்களை ஒட்டினாலும் அதற்கு வருமானம் வராது. ஏனென்றால் பிரயாணிகள் வரமாட்டார்கள். அதன் வருமானம் குறையும். அதனால் முதலாளிகள் ஓடிந்து போவார்கள். பஸ்கள் ஓடாது நின்றுவிடும். அதனால் பிரயாணிகளுக்கு அசௌகரியம், தொழிலாளிகளுக்கு அசௌகரியம். அதற்குமேல் சர்க்கார் எந்த கண்ணோட்டத்துடன் இந்த வரியைக்கொண்டு வந்தார்களோ—நாலு கோடி ரூபாயை சரிக்கட்டுவதற்கு இதன்மூலம் ஒரு கோடி, இருபது லட்சம் வருதாகச் சொல்வது—அது நடக்காது. ஆகவே யதார்த்தமான கண்ணோட்டத்துடன் இதைப் பார்க்கவேண்டும், என்று சர்க்கார் தரப்பைக் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். திருப்பித் திருப்பிச் சொல்ல விரும்பவில்லை. கஷ்டமோ நஷ்டமோ எப்பட்டியாவது இந்த வரியைக் கொண்டுவந்து இந்த வருமானத்தைப் பெறவேண்டும் என்று சர்க்கார் தரப்பார் பார்க்கிறார்கள். அரசாங்கம் புதிய வருமானம் பெறுவதற்கு வேறு வழிகள் இருக்கின்றன.

9th December 1952]

[Sri P. Jeevanandam]

பல யோசனைகள் இதற்குமுன் சர்க்கார் முன்னால் வைக்கப்பட்டுள்ளன. மத்திய அரசாங்கத்திலிருந்து நம் மாகாண சர்க்கார் தனது அதிகாரத்தின் எல்லைக்குள் நின்றுகொண்டே பட்ஜெட்டில் துணை விழுந்ததை சரிக்கட்ட முதலில் சர்க்கார் செலவைக் குறைக்கவேண்டும். அனுவசியமான செலவுகளைக் குறைக்கவேண்டும். அப்படிச் செய்தால் இந்த வரி அனுவசியம். ஆனால் செலவைக் குறைக்க சர்க்கார் தயாராக இல்லை. மேலும் மேலும் வருமானம் வந்து சேரவேண்டும் என்று சொன்னால் மக்கள் தாளமாட்டார்கள். சாதாரண மக்களை ஒடிக்காமல் சின்னச் சின்ன பலகாரங்களை ஒடிக்காமல் பல வழிகளில் சர்க்கார் வருமானத்தை அடையலாம். அதற்கு பொருளாதார நிபுணர்களைக் கேட்கலாம். பஸ் முதலாளிகளே யோசனை சொல்லுவார்கள். அப்படி இல்லாமல் வரியை வாங்கியே தீருவோம் என்று சொல்லக்கூடாது. இதை பொதுமக்களிடம் கொண்டுபோகவேண்டும். அவர்களுடைய யோசனைகளைக் கேட்கவேண்டும். முதலில் கொண்டுவந்த மசோதாவை விட்டுவிட்டு இதை புதிய ரூபத்தில் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிறார்கள். முன்பு இருந்தது இது இல்லை. இது நடைமுறையில் கொண்டுவரப்பட்டது இல்லை. ராஜாஜி ஆரம்பித்து இதைக் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிறார். இப்பொழுது பஞ்சம் அதிகரித்து வருகிறது. பொருளாதார நிலைமை பாதிக்கிறது. புயலினால் அதிக சேதம் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது. அதையும் சர்க்கார் எதிர்நோக்கி நிற்கிறது. சர்க்கார் வருமானமும் கம்மியாகி வருகிறது. பொருளாதார நெருக்கடி ஆழம் பாய்ந்து பொதுமக்களை வாட்டுகிறது. அப்படியிருக்கையில் எப்படியாவது சரிக்கட்டுவதற்கு மக்கள் தலையில் இந்த வரியை சுமத்துவது எப்படி இருக்கிறது என்றால் அதற்கு ஒரு தமிழ் பழமொழி இருக்கிறது. அதபோல் இருக்கிறது. கொம்பேரி மூக்கன் பாம்பு மனிதனைக் கடித்துவிட்டு செத்த பிரதம பச்சை பல்லக்கில் சுருகாட்டுக்குக் கொண்டோய் அங்கே நெருப்பு பற்றவைத்து புனை வருவதைப் பார்க்கும் வரையில் அந்தப் பாம்பு அங்கே மரத்தின் மேலேயே இருக்கும். அந்தப் புகையைக் கண்ட பின்புதான் அது மரத்தைவிட்டு இறங்கும் என்று சொல்லுவார்கள். அதுமாதிரி இருக்கிறது இது. எல்லா தரப்பிலும் இவ்வளவு எதிர்ப்பு இருந்தும் இந்த வரியை போட்டே தீருவோம் என்று சர்க்கார் தரப்பார் சொல்லுகிறார்கள். அதனால் பஸ் முதலாளிகள் ஒடிந்து போவார்கள், பிரயாணிகள் பஸ்ஸில் ஏற முடியாது. பஸ் 'ரூட்' இருக்கும், பஸ் ஓடாது. இப்படிப்பட்ட நிலைமைக்குத் தான் வரும். ஆகவே இந்த 'பில்'லை வாபஸ் வாங்கவேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக் கொண்டு சர்க்கார் தரப்பு தீர்மானத்தை எதிர்க்கிறேன்."

* DR. K. B. MENON :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Bill has come to its third reading stage without very many alterations and I have very little doubt that the Bill will be passed into law also as such. Personally I have made my position and the position of my party clear that we are not opposed to taxation of the rich. But we are only particular that what is collected from the rich should be passed on to the poor. I welcome the assurance that was given on the floor of the House by the Hon. Minister and we shall watch with interest how he carries them out. 5-10 p.m.

" Sir, I would like to make one or two suggestions for the consideration of the Government. I had in the beginning pointed out that the Bill vests unusual powers on the 'prescribed authority.' Clauses 10 to 15 give the 'prescribed authority' almost dictatorial powers and complete control over the transport system of the State. The only check on him as mentioned in clause 10 is the Regional Transport Officer and the Transport Commissioner as mentioned in clause 12. But I do not consider that a check of an officer on an officer is sufficient; the officialdom has its own cliques, one always trying to cover the other. But when it comes to actual rubbing of shoulders with the public, there should be better check

[Dr. K. B. Menon] [9th December 1952]

than is provided in the Bill. I have no off-hand suggestions to make except that the Government must consider setting up, on a decentralized basis, a nominated advisory council who may receive complaints and grievances against the Transport Officer. I do not believe that it is a fool-proof suggestion, but I throw it in a sporting way for the consideration of the Government.

“ One other subject that I would like to comment on is the overloading. It is a scandal in bus transport. There is overloading in railways but it is due to the ticketless travellers and they are few. The two are very different; in the case of bus transport, overloading is done by the bus-owner in order to cheat the State of its income-tax and this is done with the connivance of the police. This is nothing new. It is a well-known fact and I hope the Government will not deny it; perhaps they may be helpless in checking it. By this overloading, the bus-owners will be cheating not only the Government of India of their income-tax, but the Government of Madras also of the tax they propose to levy on them. I wish to make one or two off-hand suggestions for the consideration of the Government. There must be a good system of careful checking of tickets in buses and I am perfectly sure the bus-owners can be compelled to issue tickets to all the passengers. I feel that the responsibility of buying tickets should be thrown not on the bus-owner, but on the passenger himself. In Bombay the bus passengers are held responsible for buying the tickets and if a ticket inspector finds a passenger without a ticket, immediately he notes down his name and sends it on to the police. So, here also if the responsibility is thrown on the passenger, the evasion of income-tax or other taxes by the bus-owner can thus be prevented to some extent. You may probably think that it is a fancy suggestion, but I believe it is a matter of educating the public. In addition, the Government must also consider printing tickets and distributing them to the bus-owners or at least exercise some kind of check on the printing of tickets so that the Government may have some control over it. I make these suggestions for the consideration of the Government and hope they would authorize the police to book the bus-owners who overload their buses. There must be some change and what that change should be, I am at present unable to indicate.”

5-20
P.M.

SRI K. V. RAMESAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, we would have felt great satisfaction if the amount of tax that is to be collected under this Act is to be utilized for the improvement of roads in the mufassal. It is a well-known fact that the communication between villages is very bad and particularly in rainy season it is impossible to take to bus transport. Therefore it is necessary that the Government should have ear-marked the amount to be collected under this Act for the improvement of the village communications.

“ Sir, we oppose this taxation measure on the ground that the bus transport is not so alluring as it was some time back. We all

9th December 1952] [Sri K. V. Ramesam]

know that the prices of sugarcane and other cash crops have considerably fallen as a result of which there is a great economic depression and the profits in bus transport are fast dwindling. Therefore, I feel that the expectations of the Government may not be realized.

“As already pointed out by some hon. Members, there are several loopholes in the Act which will enable the bus operators to evade payment of tax. As pointed out by Dr. K. B. Menon, I hope the Government will take note of the defects and rectify them. In fact, there is no necessity for resorting to this measure of taxation. If it is a question of getting more revenue, bus routes can be auctioned and if this is not possible, at least restrictions in the issue of permits should be removed and any person who desires to run the business should be given a free permit. This will fetch a considerably large amount to the Government and will at the same time remove many disadvantages for persons who are ready to take to bus transport. I therefore feel that the Government may consider this suggestion and enforce it at least hereafter and remove the restrictions imposed by the Road Traffic Board.

(Sri C. Kandaswami occupied the Chair.)

“Finally, we oppose the Bill on another ground, that this measure will undoubtedly affect the through passengers and also the consumers of food articles; because in the mufassal, most of the food articles are carried only through buses, and the cost is tacked on to the prices of the food articles, and consequently it will heavily affect the poor man. Therefore we suggested that at least an amendment to reduce the rate of tax that is to be levied from 9 pies to 6 pies, might be accepted, but even this moderate and reasonable amendment was not accepted by the Government. Therefore, my submission is that this measure is ill-timed and ill-conceived and is certainly not in the best interests of the transport industry.”

*SRI V. MADANAGOPAL :—“கனம் தலைவர் அவர்களே ! இந்த மசோதாவானது எந்த சமயத்தில் வருகிறதென்பதை இந்தச் சபை மிகவும் கூர்ந்து கவனிக்கவேண்டும். மாகாணம் முழுவதிலும் மிகப் பெரிய அளவில் பஞ்சம் பரவியிருக்கக் கூடிய காலத்தில், தஞ்சை, திருச்சி போன்ற இடங்களில் கோரப் புயலினால் கோடிக்கணக்கான ரூபாய்கள் நஷ்டம் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிற காலத்தில் இந்தப் புதிய வரி கொண்டுவரப்படுகிறது. இதற்கும், அதற்கும் என்ன சம்பந்தம் ? பொது மக்களையா இந்தச் சட்டம் பாதிக்கப் போகிறது ? பஸ் முதலாளிகள் அல்லவா இந்த வரியைக் கொடுக்கப் போகிறார்கள் என்று சர்க்கார் கட்சி மெய்ர்கள் சொல்லலாம். எதிர்க்கட்சியைச் சேர்ந்தவர்கள் என்பதால் எதிர்க்க வேண்டுமென்று நாங்கள் எதிர்ப்பதாகவும் பேசலாம். உண்மையில் இந்த வரியானது கசப்பு மாத்திரைக்கு இனிப்பைத் தடவிக் கொடுப்பதைப் போல பெரும் பாலான பொதுமக்களைத் தொழிலாளிகளை பாதிக்கப் போவதை மறைத்து பஸ் முதலாளிகளைத்தான் பாதிக்கப் போகிறதென்று சாமார்த்தியமாகப் பேசப்படுகிறது. இன்று எந்த வரியை போட்டாலும் முதலாளிகள் தங்கள் லாபத்திலிருந்து கொடுப்பதில்லையென்பது நாமறிந்திருக்கும் உண்மை. மேலும் இன்றையதினம் பஸ் முதலாளிகள் தங்கள் லாபத்திலிருந்து இந்த வரியைக் கொடுக்கக் கூடிய நிலைமையில் இல்லையென்பதையும்

[Sri V. Madanagopal] [9th December 1952]

நாம் உணரவேண்டும். அதனால் நிச்சயமாக இந்த வரியானது பொது மக்களையும், தொழிலாளர்களையும் தான் பாதிக்கப் போகின்றது என்பதை நாம் பார்க்கவேண்டும். இப்படி நான் சொல்லுகிறபோது இதைச் சிறு பிள்ளைத்தனமான பேச்சாக யாரும் கருதக்கூடாது. யுத்த பிற்காலத்தில் ஏற்பட்டுக் கொண்டுவரும் பொருளாதார நெருக்கடியை உன்னிப்பாக கவனித்து வரும் ஒவ்வொருவருக்கும் இதன் உண்மை நன்கு தெரியும். யுத்த பிற்காலத்தில் மக்களின் வாங்கும் சக்தி மிகவும் குறைந்து கொண்டே வருகிறது. இன்றையதினம் வியாபாரம் மிகவும் மந்தமாகியிருக்கிறது. எல்லாத் தொழிலும் நெருக்கடியான நிலைமையில் இருக்கிறது. குறிப்பாக இந்தியாவின் புராதன கைத்தொழிலரின் கைத்தறித் தொழிலில் ஏராளமான துணி தேக்கக் கூட்கிறது. இந்த மாகாணத்தில் மட்டுமல்ல. இந்தியா பூராவிலுமே இந்த நெருக்கடி வளர்ந்துவருகிறது. இதனால் எல்லாத் தொழில்களிலும் வருமானம் குறைந்து வருவதையும், வியாபாரம் மந்தப்பட்டு வருவதையும் நாம் காணலாம். குறிப்பாக சென்னை சர்க்காரும், மத்திய சர்க்காரும் தனது வருமானத்தில் மிக அதிகமான குறைவு ஏற்படுமென்று எதிர்பார்ப்பதிலிருந்து இது நன்கு தெரியும். இதனால் தான் இன்றையதினம் எந்தப் புது வரியைக் கொண்டு வந்தாலும் பொதுவாக அது தொழிலாளர்களையும் பொது மக்களையும் தான் பாதிக்கு மென்பதை நாம் மறக்கக் கூடாது. இன்றையதினம் சில பஸ் முதலாளிகள் மிகவும் கஷ்டப்படுகிறார்கள். அவர்கள் வருமானத்தில் பெரிய அளவு குறைந்து விட்டது. தொழிலே ஸ்தம்பித்து இருக்கிறது. அதனால் இன்றைய தினம் புதிய வரியை தொழிலாளர்கள் மேலும், பொதுமக்கள் மேலும் எப்படிச் சமத்தலாம் என்ற கருத்துடையவர்களாக இருக்கிறார்கள். இதற்காக எதிர்க்கட்சிக்காரர்கள் எல்லா வரிகளையும் எதிர்ப்பதாகக் கொள்ளக் கூடாது. சில விஷயங்களையும் உங்கள் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவர விரும்புகிறேன். யுத்த பிற்காலத்தில் இந்த மாகாணத்தில் உள்ள பஞ்சாலே தொழிலாளர்கள் சம்பள உயர்வு கேட்பொழுது சம்பளத்தை உயர்த்தியது போலவே தொழிலாளர்களின் வேலைப் பளுவும் இரண்டு மடங்கு உயர்த்தப்பட்டது என்பதை நாம் பறக்கக் கூடாது. அப்பொழுது சில தொழிலாளர்களும் நீக்கப்பட்டார்கள். அதே மாதிரியாகத்தான் இப்பொழுது பஸ் முதலாளிகள் மேல் வரிபோட்டால் அவர்கள் அதை தொழிலாளர்கள் சம்பளத்தைக் குறைத்தோ, சிலரை வேலையைவிட்டு நீக்கியோ பொதுமக்கள் மீது வரியைப் போட்டுத்தான் அதைக் கட்டுவார்களே தவிர தாங்கள் அழிந்து போக ஒரு நாளும்தான் சம்பதிக்கமாட்டார்கள். நான் சென்ற வாரம் மதுரை ஜில்லாவில் தினார்க்கல்லிலுள்ள ஒரு பஸ் முதலாளியைச் சந்தித்தேன். அவருடன் பேசிக் கொண்டிருக்கும்பொழுது 49-ல் ஒரு பஸ்ஸுக்கு மாசத்தில் சராசரி மூவாயிரம் ரூபாய்கள் வந்துகொண்டிருந்தது, இன்றையதினம் கிட்டத்தட்ட இரண்டாயிரம் ரூபாய்கள் தான் வருகிறதென்று சொன்னார். அதாவது 35 % வசூல் குறைந்திருக்கிறது. ஆப்பிரேயச் செலவுகளோ எவ்வளவு உயர்த்திருக்கிறதென்பதைப் பற்றி சர்க்கார் கட்சிக்காரர்களே சொல்லியிருக்கிறார்கள்.

“ பஸ் முதலாளிகளான டி. வி. எஸ். , எஸ். ஆர். வி. எஸ். , சிம்ஸன் போன்றவைகள் இதனால் பாதிக்கப்படாமலிருக்கலாம். ஆனால் இரண்டு மூன்று பஸ்களை வைத்துக் கொண்டிருக்கும் முதலாளிகள் எல்லாம் இதனால் நசித்துப் போய்விடக்கூடிய பேரபாயம் ஏற்பட்டபோகிறது. ஒவ்வொரு ரூட்டுகளிலும் ஆயிரக்கணக்காக லாபம் சம்பாதித்துக் கொண்டிருந்த காலம் அல்ல இது. உதாரணமாக இந்தச் சென்னையிலே பிரகாஷ்மல் அஹாசன் என்ற பிரபல வட்டிக்காரரிடம் சூமார் 30 பஸ் முதலாளிகள் பஸ்களை அடகு வைத்து கடன் வாங்கியிருக்கிறார்கள். நிலத்தையும், வீட்டையும், நகைகளையும் அடகு வைப்பதண்டு. ஆனால் இன்று பஸ்களையே அடகு வைக்கவேண்டிய நிலைமை ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறதென்பதை நாம் கவனிக்க வேண்டும். இன்று புது வரி போட்டால் சர்க்கார் நிர்வந்தத்தால் அதை அவர்கள் ஒப்புக்கொண்டாலும் நிச்சயமாக பொதுஜனங்கள் தலையில் தான் அதைச் சுமத்த அவர்கள் பார்ப்பார்கள். சர்க்கார் பிரயாணிகளிடமிருந்து 7 பைசா வரையில் வசூலித்துக் கொள்ளலாமென்று கூறியுள்ளது இன்றைய

9th December 1952] [Sri V. Madanagopal]

தினம் 5 பைசா எங்கும் கிடையாது. பஸ் 6 பைசா வசூலித்துக் கொண்டு வருகிறார்கள். அதை 7 பைசாவாக நிச்சயம் உயர்த்தி விடுவார்கள். அப்படியானாலும் பொது ஜனங்களை அது பாதிக்காதா என்று நான் கேட்கிறேன். இது பொது மக்களை பாதிக்காது பஸ் முதலாளிகளைத்தான் பாதிக்குமென்று சொல்லித்தந்தாக பொது மக்களை ஏமாற்றவேண்டுமென்பதாகவும் நான் கேட்கிறேன்? சர்க்கார் தரப்பு காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களே சொன்னார். இன்றையதினம் லாரி வரியை உயர்த்தினால் அவர்கள் தேங்காய் மூட்டையை ஏற்றும் வியாபாரிகளிடமிருந்து ரூபாய் ஒன்றுக்கு பதிலாக ரூபாய் 1-2-0 வசூல் செய்து விடுவார்கள். வியாபாரி அந்த நஷ்டத்தைப் பொது மக்கள் மேல் சமத்திவிடுவான். ஆகையால் இது நிச்சயமாக பொதுமக்களைத்தான் பாதிக்கப் போகிறது. மறுபுறத்தல் நிச்சயமாக ஓரக் ஷாப்பு சிப்பந்திகளையும், பஸ் தொழிலாளர்களையும் பாதிக்கப் போகிறது. அதனால் தான் இந்த வரியைக் கொண்டுவருகிற காலத்தில் சிறிய முதலாளிகளுக்கு வலக்கு அளிக்கவேண்டுமென்று எங்கள் பக்கத்திலிருந்து கொண்டு வந்த திருத்தத்தையும் நிராகரித்துவிட்டார்கள். அதனால் மிகவும் நெருக்கடியான இந்த சமயத்தில் இந்த வரித் திட்டத்தைக் கொண்டுவருவது சரியல்லவென சொல்லிக் கொண்டு இதைக் காலவரையின்றி ஒத்தி வைக்கவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

* SRI K. R. VISWANATHAN :—“ கனம் தலைவர் அவர்களே, நான் இந்த மோட்டார் வரி மசோதாவை கீழ்க்கண்ட காரணங்களுக்காக நான் அதை எதிர்க்கின்றேன். 5-30 p.m.

“ முதலாவதாக பஸ்ஸிலே செல்லுகின்ற பிரயாணிகள் மிகவும் ஏழைகளாக இருக்கின்றார்கள். இப்பொழுது அவர்கள் கொடுத்ததுகொண்டு வருகின்ற உப்பு முதல் சினிமா வரை உள்ள வரிகளையே அவர்களால் தாங்கமுடியவில்லை. அப்படி இருக்கும்போது இன்னும் ஒரு பைசாவோ, அரை பைசாவோ, கால் பைசாவோ உயர்த்தினால் அதை அவர்களால் கொடுக்க முடியாத நிலையில் அவர்கள் இருக்கின்றார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு இப்பொழுது இருக்கின்ற ஒரு சிறு சௌகரியத்தைக்கூட எடுத்துவிடக்கூடிய நிலையில் இந்த மசோதா இருக்கிறது. அப்படியிருக்க அவர்களைப் புறக்கணிக்கக்கூடாது என்பது முதலாவது காரணம்.

“ அடுத்தபடியாக இப்பொழுது இருக்கின்ற நிலையிலே நம்முடைய மாகாணம் முழுவதும் ஒரு ஜில்லா பாக்கியில்லாமல் பஞ்ச நிலை தாண்டவ மாடிக் கொண்டிருக்கிறது. அவர்கள் தங்களுடைய வயிற்றுப் பாட்டையே கவனிப்பது எப்படி. என்று ஆலோசித்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு வேண்டிய பொருள்களை வாங்கும் சக்தி மிகவும் குறைவாக இருக்கிறது. அப்படியிருக்கின்ற இந்த நிலையிலே இம்மாதிரி அவர்களைப் பாதிக்கக் கூடிய ஒரு புது வரியைக் கொண்டுவந்து போடுவது மிகவும் அநியாயமானது என்று நான் நினைக்கவேண்டியிருக்கிறது.

“ இம்மாதிரி பஸ்ஸிலே பிரயாணம் செய்கின்ற பிரயாணிகளுக்கு வரி விதிக்காமல் இருந்தால் நல்லதாக இருக்கும். மோட்டார் சொந்தக்காரர்களுக்கு வரி போடுவதைப்பற்றி அதிகமாக நான் எதிர்ப்பதற்கில்லை. இருந்தாலும்கூட சிறு பஸ் முதலாளிகள் இருக்கிறார்கள், அவர்களுக்கு ஒரு வாறு சலுகை காட்டலாம். அதிக லாபம் பெறக்கூடிய அதிகமான எண்ணிக்கையுள்ள பஸ்களையோ, லாரிகளையோ வைத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கக்கூடிய வர்களுக்கு அதிகமான வரியைப் போடுவதனால் பரவாயில்லை. பஸ் பிரயாணிகளுக்குப்போடுகின்ற வரியை பெரிய பஸ் முதலாளிகளுக்குப் போட்டால் பாதகமில்லை.

“ பஸ் முதலாளிகள் சாதாரணமாக எப்படி அதிக லாபம் பெறுகின்றார்கள் என்றால் சர்க்காருடைய சலுகையை சிலபேர் வாங்கிக்கொண்டிருக்கின்றார்கள். அம்மாதிரி இருக்கக்கூடிய பஸ் முதலாளிகளுக்கு அதிக வரி விதித்துப்பணம் வாங்குவது மேலாகும் என்று கருதுகின்றேன்.

“ அதிக லாபம் பெறக்கூடிய பஸ் முதலாளிகள் இரண்டு விதமாக இருக்கின்றார்கள். ஒன்று, அதிக எண்ணிக்கை பஸ்களை வைத்துக்கொண்டும்,

9th December 1952] [Sri C. H. Kanaran]

അൾക്കു വില നീച്ചയായും വർദ്ധിക്കും. കാരണം ചരക്ക് ഗതാഗതത്തിന്റേലുള്ള ചിലവു വലുതാവൂ ചരക്കിന്റെ വിലയെ ബാധിക്കും. കൂടാതെ ബസ്സ് യാത്രക്കാർക്കു ചാർജ്ജ് ജാസ്സി കൊടുക്കേണ്ടി വരും. ഇങ്ങനെ യാത്രക്കും സാധനങ്ങൾക്കും വില ജാസ്സിയാക്കു അക്കു വിധത്തിലുള്ള ഒരു നികുതിയാണ്. ഈ ബില്ലുകൊണ്ട് ഗവണ്മെന്റ് ചുമത്താൻ ഉദ്ദേശിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതു്. ഇതു നാട്ടുകാർക്കു ബാധകമാകുകയില്ല, ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാർക്കു ബാധകമാവൂ എന്നു ഗവണ്മെന്റ് പറയുമായിരിക്കാം. ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട പ്രധാനമന്ത്രി ശ്രീ സി. രാജഗോപാലാചാരി മുഖ്യ മന്ത്രിയായിരുന്ന കാലത്തു് കൊണ്ടുവന്ന Sales tax ഇതിന്നു ചരു ഉദാഹരണമാണ്. അന്നു പറഞ്ഞു Sales tax എന്നതു കച്ചവടക്കാരുടെ മേലുള്ള നികുതിയാണ്, അതു ജനങ്ങളെ ബാധിക്കുന്ന നികുതിയല്ലെന്നു്. യഥാർത്ഥത്തിൽ വില്ക്കുന്ന വന്റെ മേലുള്ള ഒരു നികുതിയാണെന്നു്. എന്നാൽ അർത്ഥം എന്താണ്. സാധനങ്ങൾ വില്ക്കുന്ന കച്ചവടക്കാരൻ വാങ്ങുന്നവന്റെ കയ്യിൽനിന്നു ഈ നികുതി ചോദിക്കുന്നു. അങ്ങനെ അതു ഇറക്കിക്കുന്നു. അതുപോലെ ചര ബസ്സു ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാരുടെ മേൽ ചുമത്തുന്ന നികുതികൊണ്ടു് എന്താണ് വരവ് പോകുന്നത്. തൊഴിലാളികളുടെ ശമ്പളം വെട്ടിച്ചുരുക്കും. മുതലാളിമാർക്കു് ഏതെല്ലാം തരത്തിൽ യാത്രക്കാരുടെ കയ്യിൽനിന്നു പണം വാങ്ങുവാൻ സാധിക്കുമോ അതിന്നുള്ള ശ്രമങ്ങളെല്ലാം അവർ നടത്തും. അതുപോലെ തന്നെ കച്ചവടക്കാർ അവരുടെ സാധനങ്ങൾക്കു വില വർദ്ധിപ്പിക്കും. ഏതു നിലയിൽ നോക്കുകയാണെങ്കിലും സാധാരണക്കാർക്കു രക്ഷയില്ല. എന്നാൽ ഈ നികുതി ചുമത്തിട്ടുള്ളതു വ്യവസായത്തിന്നു ലാഭം ഉണ്ടോ എന്നു പരിശോധിച്ചിട്ടാണോ? വാസ്തവത്തിൽ അല്ല. കാരണം ജില്ലകളിലും ഉള്ള ലോറി ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാർ ഈ ബില്ല് കൊണ്ടുവന്ന അവസരത്തിൽ സംഘം ചേർന്നുകൊണ്ടു് ഈ ബില്ല് കൊണ്ടുവരുന്നവൻ പാടില്ലെന്നു പറഞ്ഞു മെമ്മോറാണ്ടങ്ങൾ ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്നു അയച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടു്. പല ജില്ലകളിലും, ഗുണ്ടൂർ, സേലം മുതലായ ജില്ലകളിലെ ലോറി ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാർ സംഘടിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു് ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടിട്ടുണ്ടു്. അവർ ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്നു ഇപ്പോൾ കൊടുക്കുന്ന നികുതിയുടെ കണക്കുകൾ, അവരുടെ മറ്റുള്ള ചിലവുകൾ, പെട്രോളിന്നു ഉള്ള സംഖ്യ ഇവയുടെ എല്ലാം കണക്കുകൾ ഉദ്ധരിച്ചു കൊണ്ടു ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്നു് മെമ്മോറാണ്ടം അയച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടു്. ഈ കണക്കുകൾ നിക്ഷേപിക്കുവാൻ ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്നു സാധിക്കുമോ എന്നു ഞാൻ ചോദിക്കുന്നു. യാതൊന്നും ശ്രദ്ധിക്കാതെ ഏതെങ്കിലും തരത്തിൽ നികുതികൾ ഇറക്കുന്നെന്നെന്ന നിലയിൽ നികുതി ചുമത്തിക്കു ഉയരം എന്ന മർക്കറ്റിലുയർന്നു എന്തൊരു ന്യായമാണ് ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്നു ഈ നികുതി ചുമത്താനുള്ളതെന്നു ഞാൻ ചോദിക്കുന്നു. ഇതിന്നു യാതൊരു ന്യായവുമില്ല. ഇതു മാത്രമല്ല, ലോറി ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാരും ബസ്സ് ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാരും എങ്ങിനെയാണ് കാര്യങ്ങൾ നടത്തുന്നതെന്നു നോക്കുകയാണെങ്കിൽ പരാമാർത്ഥത്തിൽ പോലീസിന്നു കൈകൂലി കൊടുത്തിട്ടുള്ളു? പോലീസ് സ്റ്റേഷൻ കടന്നുപോകുമ്പോൾ ബസ്സ് ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാരും ലോറി ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാരും പോലീസ് സ്റ്റേഷനിൽ കൈകൂലി കൊടുക്കുന്നു. ഇതു നാട്ടിലാകമാനം നടക്കുന്നില്ലേ? ഇതു് മന്ത്രിമാർക്കും നാട്ടുകാർക്കും കമ്പോളം അറിയുന്ന ഒരു സംഗതിയാണ്. കാരണം പോലീസുകാരുടെ ശമ്പളംകൂടാതെ ഇന്നു അവർക്കു് സ്വസ്സും ലോറിയും കാടകു വാൻ സാധിക്കുകയില്ല. വലിയ വലിയ കമ്പനി ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാരാണെങ്കിൽ പോലീസുകാർക്കു് കൈകൂലി കൊടുക്കേണ്ടി വരില്ല. അയാൾ DSP ക്ക് കൈകൂലികൊടുത്താൽ മതി. അതു മേലെന്നിന്നാണ് ആരംഭിക്കുക. വലിയ വലിയ ബസ്സു ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാരിൽനിന്നു സാധു പോലീസുകാരനു കൈകൂലി വാങ്ങുവാൻ സാധിക്കുകയില്ല. അവർ വലിയ വലിയ ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാർക്കു കൈകൂലി കൊടുക്കുന്നുണ്ടാകും എന്ന വ്യവസ്ഥമേയുള്ളു ചുരുക്കി പറയുകയാണെങ്കിൽ എന്തെല്ലാം വിചിത്രതകൾ അംഗീകിച്ചുകൊണ്ടാണ് ബസ്സ് കാടകു ന്നതെന്നു പരിശോധന നടത്താതെയാണ് ഈ പുതിയ നികുതി കൊണ്ടുവന്നിട്ടുള്ളതു്. സേലം ഡിവിഷൻ ബസ്സ് കാണൽസ് അസോസിയേഷൻ കൊടുത്ത മെമ്മോറാണ്ടത്തിൽ പറയുന്നത് അവർക്കു് ദൈവിന്നു 1½ ക. ഉറപ്പിക വാങ്ങുവാനുള്ള അധികാരം ഉണ്ടെങ്കിലും 12 ന്. മാത്രമേ കിട്ടുന്നുള്ളു എന്നു്. ഒന്നൊന്നു ലോറി ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാരുടെ സ്ഥിതി നോക്കുകയാണെങ്കിൽ അവർക്കു നഷ്ടത്തിലല്ലാതെ നടത്തുവാൻ സാധിക്കുന്നില്ല. 10 ഉം 20 ഉം ലോറികളുള്ളവരും 10 ഉം 25 ഉം ബസ്സുള്ള ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാരും മാത്രമേ ഇക്കാലത്തു അവ നടത്തുവാൻ കഴിയുകയുള്ളു. കാരണം പല വിധത്തിലു നിക്ഷേപികളും മറ്റും കൊടുക്കാതെ കച്ചവടവാറുള്ള മാർഗ്ഗങ്ങൾ അവർക്കുണ്ടു്. അവരുടെ കണക്കുകൾ ശരിപ്പെടുത്തുവാൻ സാധിക്കും. വലിയ വലിയ ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാർ Checking ന് തന്നാൽ അവരേയും ശരിപ്പെടുത്തുവാൻ സാധിക്കും. ഷോൺഗ്രൂപ്പിനെ ചിന്തിക്കുന്നു. V. S. കമ്പനിപോലെയുള്ള കമ്പനികൾക്കു നികുതി വന്നാലും ഒരു സമാധാനമുണ്ടാകും.

[Sri C. H. Kanaran]

[9th December 1952]

ചെറിയ ചെറിയ ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാർ ഒന്നൊന്നു പോറിയും ബസ്സും ഉള്ളവർ വെച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതൊക്കെ ബസ്സിന്റെയും ലോറിയുടെയും സകല കണക്കുവകാശവും ഞങ്ങൾക്കു കിട്ടും. ഞങ്ങൾക്കു തന്നെ ഈ രാജ്യത്തിൽ ബസ്സിന്റെയും ലോറിയുടെയും അധിപന്മാരായി, രാജാക്കന്മാരായി തീരുവാൻ സാധിക്കും. അതുകൊണ്ടു നികുതി വന്നുകൊള്ളട്ടെ, തരക്ഷിക്കൂ എന്നുള്ള അഭിപ്രായം ഉണ്ടാകാം കാരണം അദ്ദേഹമായ ഇവയെ നികുതികൾ വരുന്ന എല്ലാ കാലത്തും ചെറിയവൻ പൊളിയുകയാണ് ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ളതു്. ഈ ബില്ലിന് പല ഭേദഗതികളും ഇവിടെ കൊണ്ടുവരികയുണ്ടായി. മൂന്നു വാഹനങ്ങൾക്കും അഞ്ചു വാഹനങ്ങൾക്കും മേലെയുള്ളവരുടെമേൽ മാത്രമേ ഈ നികുതി ചുമത്താനു പാടുള്ളൂ എന്നു ആവശ്യപ്പെടുന്ന ഭേദഗതി കൂടി ഗവണ്മെന്റ് സ്വഗതം ചെയ്തിട്ടില്ല. എന്നാണു് ഇതിന്റെ അർത്ഥം. ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്നറിയാം ഈ നികുതി ചുമത്തിയാൽ ചെറിയവനാണു കോട്ടാവരിക എന്നു്. അപ്പോൾ T. V. S. നെ പോലെയുള്ള വലിയ കമ്പനികൾ കോൺഗ്രസ്സിന്റെ നെടുമുളക്കയല കമ്പനികൾക്കും ലാഭംകിട്ടും. അതു കിട്ടട്ടെ എന്നാണു് കോൺഗ്രസിനുള്ളതു്. യഥാർത്ഥത്തിൽ നികുതി ചുമത്തണമെങ്കിൽ വമ്പിച്ച പണപോലായ ആളുകളുടെ മേൽ നികുതി ചുമത്തുന്ന സമ്പ്രദായം കൊണ്ടുവരട്ടെ. അപ്പോഴെ എല്ലാവർക്കും ഒരു പോലെ നികുതി ചുമച്ചു കയറണമെങ്കിൽ വ്യവസായം നടത്തുവാൻ സാധിക്കുമോ എന്നാണു ചോദിക്കാനുള്ളതു്. ഈ ബില്ല് പാസ്സാക്കുവാൻ പാടില്ല ഇതിനെ ഞാൻ ശക്തമായി എതിർക്കുന്നു എന്നു് പറഞ്ഞുകൊണ്ടു് ഞാൻ അന്തരീക്ഷിക്കുന്നു."

* SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIYAR:—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, for the first time we are faced with a taxation measure; but of course nobody is taken by surprise, because we had such an indication even as early as June when the Hon. Finance Minister made his Budget speech. After hearing the controversial debate, upon this taxation measure, I am reminded of the words of a famous British Finance Minister who said: ‘It is as difficult to tax and please people as it is to love and be wise.’ Apart from that, Sir, when the Bill was originally introduced, it was sought to tax the passengers, and the Bill was named ‘The Madras Stage Carriages Surcharge Bill.’ The Bill was very clear, and it was not as complicated as the present Bill. Everyone was made to understand that the Government wanted to levy a surcharge at the rate of one pie per mile on every passenger and nobody came forward and represented on behalf of the travelling public either to give up the measure or to make necessary modifications in it. But curiously, the bus operators, big and small, for the first time met in Madras in a conference and made some representations to the Government. So far as my knowledge goes, the bus operators came forward with a voluntary offer undertaking to forego a portion of their income and they did not want to shoulder the onerous responsibility of collecting one pie per mile more from the passengers. They put forward two reasons: firstly they said that it would be a very difficult and arduous task to maintain running accounts and secondly they said there would be a great reduction in the passenger traffic. Perhaps the bus operators did not like to submit their accounts for either scrutiny or further scrutiny. Whatever may be the reason, this is the only representation made on behalf of the bus operators. But subsequently, we are now faced with a Bill which says that it is a ‘Madras Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill.’ The Hon. Chief Minister said in his speech and the Hon. the Transport Minister also wanted to convince us that the name of the Bill as now given does not mean that it is a taxation of

9th December 1952] [Sri P. Rangaswami Reddiyar]

passengers, but that it is a taxation of bus operators. Sir, let me at once submit to this House that if it is really a taxation of passengers, we are opposed and we are bound to oppose it, and all hon. Members are bound to oppose it; because next to the bicycle, the bus happens to be the luxurious conveyance so far as the common man is concerned. Already in almost all places, the common man is made to pay at the rate of 7 pies per mile, and there is no use trying now to burden him further. But if it is really a taxation upon the bus operators, I wish to ask why there should be this proviso to clause 3. If it is a simple provision stating that the tax will be a certain portion of the income of the bus operators, there ends the matter. Some distinction was sought to be made between the routes in which there is already a taxation of 7 pies per mile and the routes in which 5 pies or 6 pies per mile is charged. I want to put a simple question. In all the routes in which only 5 pies per mile is charged, are we to understand that the bus operators are charitably inclined not to charge 7 pies but only 5 pies? Certainly not. In such routes, the bus operators know that any further addition to the fare would really tell upon the passenger traffic. That is why the bus operators think they can get in such routes a maximum of 5 pies only and that is why they are charging only 5 pies and not 7 pies. As we read, the only important clause, clause 3, though it aims at charging only a portion of the income, in actual practical working, I am convinced it would really throw a burden on the passenger. So far as the bus operators are concerned, I think they enjoy the maximum privilege in this State. In the Madras Information, June issue, I find a notification to the effect 'All Regional Transport Authorities are instructed to issue bus permits liberally and at the same time the interests of the existing operators shall not be affected.' Any such safeguard or assurance is not given to any other business or industry or body of persons belonging to other professions. This is a unique assurance given by the Government to bus operators in this State, not to affect the interests of the bus operators. Therefore, tax on bus operators is just. That was the first impression which I got at the time. But after hearing the speeches and after having had conversations with some hon. Members, and especially those who have experience of the transport business, I am a little bit convinced that only the big bus operators would be able to survive this taxation measure and the small bus operators owning only two or three buses would have to quit the field ultimately. (At this stage, Mr. Speaker occupied the Chair.) I think after a careful analysis of the arguments advanced, there is some meaning in the argument that if this taxation measure is passed into an Act, perhaps the biggest bus operators only would survive in due course and the small operators would quit the field. Sir, taking that view and accepting that kind of argument, I am afraid that, at this rate, only a few operators who command a great number of buses and good business would be able to survive.

[Sri P. Rangaswami Reddiyar] [9th December 1952]

“ Now, Sir, so far as Tiruchirappalli is concerned, I do not find there is any single route in which they charge 5 or even 6 pies. Throughout the district, I think, the maximum of 7 pies per mile is charged and so the bus operators cannot charge even one pie or half a pie more per mile, because the passengers will feel the increase. And if the operators resort to some other means, that is charging for the goods—even if they carry below the maximum weight that is allowed—I think the passengers would be made to feel the increase.

“ So far as the lorries are concerned, I shall give the figures roughly. Each lorry-owner has to pay for each lorry Rs. 1,440 by way of taxes; Rs. 110 for insurance; Rs. 1,800 for drivers; Rs. 1,080 for cleaners; Rs. 50 for brake certificate and Rs. 1,500 as expenditure at the time for brake certificate for repairing the lorry and for servicing, etc., and for tyres and spare parts Rs. 4,800, making up a total of Rs. 10,780 for each lorry. So, if the lorry-owner puts Rs. 10,780 as the minimum for maintaining a lorry, I am afraid, he will not be able to find any other amount to pay the Government tax. So, Sir, it is not correct to say that the bus-owners and lorry-owners can bear this tax. Certainly to my knowledge, lorry owners have not earned tons of money as it was remarked by the Hon. the Chief Minister. Of course, there may be some lorry owners in this State who have made much money, but taking the business as a whole and the number of employees involved in this business, they deserve consideration at the hands of the Government, and I think, the lorries may be omitted from this Bill and the bus owner alone may be taken into consideration. And even in the cases of buses, only the operators should be made to pay the charge and not the passengers either directly or indirectly. If the bus operators' income is to be taxed, then the question would naturally arise whether it may not amount to income-tax. If the Bill exclusively confines itself to taxing a portion of the income of the bus operator—whatever may be the name that may be given to the Act—it would amount to charging on the income, which may mean income-tax. So, Sir, taking all these things into consideration, I think the Bill is inopportune. Though there is a deficit and the Government are bound to make up the deficit, I think the Bill is not happily drafted. So, I oppose the Bill.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I have given enough time for discussing this Bill and I find there is too much of repetition in the discussion. I am thinking of finishing this Bill to-day and will call on the Hon. Minister to reply to the debate at 6-30 p.m.”

6 p.m. * SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is necessary for me on behalf of my party to draw a clear line of distinction between the opposition of the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Ramamurthy and our opposition. There are two types of inopportune. Though there is a deficit and the Government are the opposition which stems ultimately or rather directly from the

9th December 1952] [Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai]

bus operators. There is the other type of opposition, which is the opposition from the poor passengers, who resent any increase in the burden of taxation.

"I am glad, Sir, that the Hon. the Chief Minister should have provoked Mr. Ramamurthy to a very clear statement of the policy that his party advocates in the Assembly. Perhaps his recent visit to Berlin, and his proximity to the 19th Congress of the Russian Communist Party have clarified his mind with regard to the policy which his party is advocating to-day. He quoted at some length the Communist manifesto to the effect that a Government hurls the charge of Communism at every opposition to it. But the quotation further states that the opposition not infrequently hurls back the charge of Communism to the other side. In this case, what in effect is the statement he has made? In effect he states, 'I am not advocating a policy of Communism.' He defends the bus operators against what he characterized as a rapacious, avaricious, Communist attempt of the Ministry in seeking to take some portion of the exorbitant profits that they are making, and he went on to say that his party does not stand for nationalization of capitalist property. The Congress party at least during the elections stated in its manifesto that it stands for nationalization of the bus transport services. But, Mr. Ramamurthy, the representative of the Communist party, says that his party, despite the label of Communism, does not stand for nationalization of industry, or the means of exchange or transport in the State of Madras. To that extent, Sir, it must be admitted that the Congress, though in a halting way, is proceeding with the nationalization of bus transport services. In Madras City—there is the Government City Bus Transport Service and in the Bombay State also, the Congress Government have nationalized a goodly portion of motor transport. Therefore, at least as far as nationalization of bus transport services is concerned, surprising as it may seem, the Congress is to the left of the Communist party.

"In regard to his role, namely, of being defender of capitalist property, I think it is not new. Let me remind you, Sir, of the masterly silence maintained by the leaders of the Communist party when the Death Duties Bill was discussed in the House of the People. On that occasion they did not have the courage to come forward and support the vested interests in their oppositions to that measure. As I said earlier, the recent visit of Mr. Ramamurthy to Berlin has clarified his ideas and now he does not flinch from openly and shamelessly defending the interests of the capitalists on the floor of the Assembly. I am glad that he has come forward with a clear statement that he stands for vested interests. Sir, it has been the fate of every social reformer to see his doctrine vulgarized and perverted by his alleged disciples. That is why on a celebrated occasion Calvin confessed that he was no Calvinist. If Marx in his grave should hear Mr. Ramamurthy declaiming in his name that capitalist property should not

[Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai]

[9th December 1952]

be nationalized, he too may repeat: 'But I am not a Marxist.' The members of the Communist party say that they do not stand for nationalization. Why do they say now that they do not stand for nationalization of industries, of the means of exchange and of communication? They say that India is not ripe for socialism, ripe for nationalization. I want to ask the members of the Communist party whether India to-day is economically less backward than Russia in 1917. If Russia in 1917 was ripe for the socialist overturn, well, I submit that India to-day is ripe for the socialist overturn. Let me remind my Communist Friends that in January 1948 at their Calcutta Conference they came to the conclusion that India was not only ripe objectively for the socialist overturn, but was also ripe subjectively for it, and they called for an insurrection. What has happened to the Telengana martyrs?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"Let the hon. Member confine his remarks to the contents of the Bill."

* SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI:—"Are they going to apologize to the relatives of the Telengana martyrs that the policy which they adopted in January 1948 was a policy of adventurism? Are they going to say that their policy was wrong and that to-day they are trying to rehabilitate themselves in capitalist society? Every pleader of reaction has always tried to pretend that his policy is in the interests of the people and that he is defending public interests against the attempts of the Government to subvert them."

"I am surprised to hear Mr. Ramamurthi say that, if this Bill is passed into law, it will mean cutting down of the wages of workers, retrenchment of staff and cancellation of bonuses, because the Bill, according to him, reduces the profits of the bus operators which are said to be low. This plea that bus operators are not making enough profits is the greatest disservice to the working class. His speech in the Assembly will be quoted by every bus operator before industrial tribunals when the workers claim higher wages or increased bonuses. Let me remind him of the award which Mr. Venkatarama Ayya gave with regard to wages in the bus transport services in the Madras State. My organization and his organization criticized Mr. Venkatarama Ayya for his weak and halting estimate of the profits which the bus transport services were making. Let me read from that award, and I am sure Mr. Ramamurthi will not deny the correctness of it. It was estimated by Mr. Venkatarama Ayya in his award that for a bus costing Rs. 15,000, after allowing interest at $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on the capital, the surplus profit was Rs. 4,587. This is one estimate of Mr. Venkatarama Ayya. Let me quote the other estimate. Mr. Venkatarama Ayya quotes in his award the statement made by the Southern Roadways, Madurai, which admits a surplus profit of Rs. 4,000 per bus. Now new taxation has been imposed between the date of the award and the present time to modify these figures. There cannot be any doubt that the bus transport

9th December 1952] [Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai]

services are minting money. That is why we want to draw a distinction between the line of opposition which Mr. Ramamurthi has adopted and the line of opposition we are adopting. We are not pleading the case of the bus operators. Mr. Ramamurthi to-day is ready to form a united front of capitalist interests, of all the opponents of this measure including those on the Congress Benches. We are opposing the measure for a different reason, the reason being that the proposed tax can be passed on, may be and perhaps will be passed on to the poor passenger."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Should the hon. Member oppose it on a hypothetical ground?"

* SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI:—"I am not opposing it on hypothetical grounds. I am opposing it on the basis of a provision in the Bill. Every intelligent man will have noted the redundant clause in the Bill which says that the present maximum rates will not be altered. What is the reason for introducing this redundant provision? It is introduced to hide the fact that there is a possibility of the rate being raised from 6 pies to 7 pies. It is possible for a bus operator to charge an extra 32 pies per rupee earned and return only 9 pies to the Government. In other words, he will become a tax-gatherer minting 32 pies and returning only 9 pies to the Government. If the Government gives an assurance that as a result of this measure, the rates will not be increased and that, if increased, they are ready to come forward with an Ordinance freezing the passenger fares at the rates prevailing at the time of the introduction of this Bill, my Party is ready to support this measure. We are not opposed to taxation of the rich; we are ready to support such taxation. Mr. Ramamurthi says that he opposes this measure because it may lead to further expenditure on Police. If that be so, he must oppose all taxation measures. But he is prepared to support measures adversely affecting zamindars. The illogicality of that position is clear to any intelligent mind.

"Sir, we have got another criticism to make with reference to this measure. The Congress Party has said that it stands for nationalization of transport. The Government run by the Congress Party in this State have nationalized the bus transport service in the City of Madras. Why do not the Government nationalize the bus transport services in the entire State if the profit-making capacity is as great as they admit?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Difficulties of management."

* SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI:—"I do not think that the Government are so inefficient or more inefficient than the bus operators."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"All the Members of the Opposition say that we are inefficient."

[9th December 1952]

* SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI :—“ I cannot take that statement at its face value and I do not believe that the Government can be more inefficient than the bus operators. If the Government constitute a committee of this House to go into the working of the bus transport service in the City, I think it will be possible to raise the income from that source by implementing the recommendations of that committee. If the Government are ready to give an assurance that this is only a temporary measure intended for making up the deficit in the Budget and that they will as soon and as expeditiously as possible implement the policy of nationalization, we on this side of the House are ready to give our support to this measure.”

6-10
p.m.

* SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, it may be said that this Bill is to tax only the bus operators and not the bus passengers. As was pointed out by the hon. Member Sri T. Viswanatham, this Bill imposes a tax indirectly on the passengers. In some places, the buses do not charge the maximum rate of 7 pies per mile. As a result of this Bill, the bus operators may resort to increase the fares to the maximum limit. It is admitted by Members, including the Members on the Government side and the Hon. Ministers, that there is not much gain to the operators and that some of them are even working at a loss. The Government say that they introduced this Bill to make up the deficit in the Budget. In this connexion, I wish to point out that the large expenditure on Police and other departments may be cut down. Many Members feel that a separate department for enforcing Prohibition is unnecessary and that it may be abolished. By doing so, there will not be deficit in the Budget and there will be no need for fresh taxation. The other day the hon. Member Sri Pragada Kotaiah supported the Bill. While supporting the Bill he said that bus operators who are owning one or two buses and bus services run by ex-servicemen and co-operative societies should be exempted from this levy, and that a revised scale should be adopted for other bus services. It is curious to see that the hon. Member, while extending co-operation to the Government by one hand, is technically taking away that co-operation by the other hand. His support is not either in spirit or in substance. Surely, the bus operators owning one or two buses or the services run by ex-servicemen and the co-operative societies should be exempted, or a revised scale of levy should be adopted. There are certain bus routes on which at particular favourable timings the bus operators are running their buses for the last two decades or more and they are making a lot of money enjoying those routes and timings as vested rights. They are even now making a lot of money. These bus operators should be taxed. Our K.L. Party made a proposal to the Government that such routes should be auctioned, and we said that by such auctions the Government could expect to get a large income— income to the tune of crores of rupees. Auctioning these routes will also give some chance to other bus operators to make fortune to some extent.

9th December 1952] [Sri P. Pundarikashacharyulu]

“ Sir, in conclusion I request Government to reconsider the question and drop the Bill, and meet the deficit in the budget by auctioning bus routes. With these words I oppose the Bill, Sir.”

* SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI:—“ అధ్యక్ష, రాయల్స్ మలో చిన్న చిన్న బస్సు యజమానులయొక్క, లారీ యజమానులయొక్క పరిస్థితి చూచినట్లయిన, అక్కడే ప్రజలయొక్క ఆర్థిక పరిస్థితి చూచినట్లయిన, ఈ బస్సు యజమానులైనను లారీ యజమానులైనను ఇప్పుడు వేస్తూన్న టువంటి ఈ పన్నులను సమర్థించుటకు వీలులేదు. కనుక దీనిని నేను సమర్థింపజాలను. ఈ సందర్భములో మన ముఖ్యమంత్రి గారు ఈ బిల్లును సమర్థించుటకును, వ్యతిరేకపక్షమువారి వ్యతిరేకాన్ని తగ్గించుకొనుటకును, ఈ బిల్లుకు సంబంధములేనటువంటి శాంతి ఉద్యమముయొక్క విషయములు ఇక్కడ లేకుండానున్నట్లు చాలా శోచనీయకరమైనటువంటి విషయము. ఇటువంటి సందర్భములో శాంతి ఉద్యమముగురించి మాట్లాడవలసిన అవసరమేమి అని నేను వారిని ప్రశ్నించుచున్నాను. నిజముగా ఈ శాంతి ఉద్యమముతో మాడు సంవత్సరాలుగా నాకు సంబంధము ఉన్నది. ఆభిలఘారత శాంతి ఉద్యమములో సభ్యుడుగా గూడా ఉన్నాను. కనుక ఈ శాంతి ఉద్యమము విమోచిస్తున్నది. దీని ఆశయములేమి అనేటటువంటిది నాకు బాగా తెలుసును. ఈ శాంతి ఉద్యమము పీరోషిమా, నగసాకిలో Atom Bomb ప్రయోగమువల్ల కాలినటువంటి పరిస్థితులనుగూర్చి, దీని ప్రయోగాన్ని యధాలను నిరోధించుటకు ప్రయత్నిస్తున్నది. అంతేకాకుండా ఈ శాంతిసభ ప్రపంచంలో జరిగేటటువంటి ఈ యధాలన్నిటినికూడా వ్యతిరేకించినటువంటి చరిత్రయున్నది. మాడు విప్లవెనుక దీని చరిత్ర వివిధంగా ఉన్నదో రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు వెనుకకు తిరిగిచూస్తే దీని సూచారము వారికి అర్థమవుతుంది. ఈ శాంతి ఉద్యమము యధాలన్ని ప్రోత్సహించేది కాదని, ఇది కమ్యూనిస్టు పార్టీయొక్క ఉద్యమము కాదని వారికి మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. వారు దీని విషయము మాట్లాడి విమర్శించందువల్ల, ఈ సభలో శాంతి ఉద్యమముతో సంబంధములేనటువంటి చాలామంది మిత్రులు కమ్యూనిస్టు పార్టీకి సంబంధించినదని అనుకొనడం జరుగుతోంది. ఇది నిజంగా కమ్యూనిస్టు ఉద్యమము కాదని తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. ఈ శాంతి ఉద్యమానికి పంజాబు కాంగ్రెసు లీడర్ అయినటువంటి డాక్టర్ కేమ్లూ గారు అధ్యక్షులుగా ఉన్నారు, తరువాత గాంధీమహాత్ము శిష్యు కుమరప్పగారు దీనికి ఉపాధ్యక్షులుగా ఉన్నారు. వీరేకాకుండా సుందర్లాల్ కోసాంచి మొదలగు ఇతర వి పార్టీకి చెందినవారు చాలామంది ఈ ఆభిలఘారత శాంతి ఉద్యమములో ఉంటూ యధాలకు వ్యతిరేకంగా పనిచేస్తున్నారని తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. ఈ శాంతి ఉద్యమము మాడవ యధాలన్ని ఆరికట్టుటకు సమర్థిస్తున్నదిగాని మరేమి కాదు. కనుక ఈ శాంతి ఉద్యమాన్ని విమర్శిస్తూ ప్రధానమైనటువంటి ఈ శాసనసభ సమావేశములో, ఈ శాంతి ఉద్యమానికి వ్యతిరేకంగా ఒక విసురు విసురుకూ మాట్లాడడం సరియైనదికాదు. నిజంగా ఈ శాంతి ఉద్యమముయొక్క చరిత్రనుబట్టిచూస్తే, ఇంగ్లండు ప్రభుత్వము శాంతి సభ ఆ దేశములో జరిగకుండా చేసే దినములలోనే ప్రజాసామ్యుదేశములో ఆ మహాసభలు ఏర్పాటుచేసే సభను జయప్రథంగా జరిపించారు. కనుక రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు ఈ విధమైన విషయాలన్నీ మాట్లాడుతూ, విదోవిధంగా ప్రతిపక్షముయొక్క వ్యతిరేకతను తగ్గించుకొనే ఉద్దేశముతో కొంత విభేదము కల్పించేందుకు ఇటువంటి ప్రయత్నముచేయుట సరిఅయినది కాదని వారిని హెచ్చరిస్తున్నాను.

[Sri T. Lakshminarayana Reddi] [9th December 1952]

“తరువాత ఈ బిల్లు విషయములో మాత్రము, ఇప్పుడున్న ఆర్థిక పరిస్థితిలో ప్రజల యొక్క కొనుగోలుశక్తి తగ్గిపోవడంతో సమయంలో, బస్సు యజమానులు, లారీ యజమానులు, సరియైన ఆదాయములేక, చాలా కష్టనష్టాలకు గురిఅగుచుండునటువంటి సమయంలో ఈ ఆదనపు వస్తులను విమాత్రము భరించే స్థితిలోలేరని, కనుక ప్రస్తుతానికి ఈ బిల్లును నిలిపివేసి, వచ్చే బడ్జెటు సమావేశముతరువాత కావలసియుంటే అప్పుడు దీనిని ఆలోచించవచ్చునని మనవిచేస్తూ ఈ బిల్లును వ్యతిరేకిస్తున్నాను.

“ముఖ్యముగా ఈ సందర్భములో రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు ఈ శాంతి ఉద్యమము విషయము మాట్లాడినప్పుడు, నేను point of order raise చేశాను, కాని స్పీకరు గారు దాన్ని నిరాకరించడం జరిగింది; తత్ఫలితంగా నేను walk out చేయడముగూడ జరిగింది. కనుక, రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు ఇతర రాజకీయ విషయాలేవైన మాట్లాడ వచ్చుగాని ఈ శాంతి ఉద్యమము విషయముగురించి ఇక్కడ విమర్శించియుండకూడదని వారిని హెచ్చరిస్తూ ఓరమించుకొంటున్నాను.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have had now nearly two days of debate on this Bill. Amendments have been gone through, and, in spite of the fact that most of the amendments have been rejected and the Government have succeeded in getting the clauses of this Bill passed, I would like to submit that we on this side of the House do not at all feel convinced about the correctness of the Government in bringing forward this measure.

“ I do not want to go into certain allegations that were made by one of the previous speakers—the hon. Member Mr. Anthoni Pillai. I do not think that this is the platform which I should misuse for the purpose of having political discussions of an ideological nature, which that particular brand of Socialism represents. We are concerned with this measure which the Government have brought forward. The main argument that the hon. Member Mr. Anthoni Pillai adduced is one which concerns us. He referred to the adjudication report of Sri M. Venkataramayya, which is dated 1947. He pointed out that in 1947 both of us opposed that adjudication report, that Mr. Venkataramayya's findings were based on incorrect figures, and that bus owners were, in fact, making much more profits than what had actually been disclosed to the adjudicator. We forget one thing here, and, that is, that five long years have elapsed between now and 1947. During these five years the economic condition of this country has not remained the same as it was in 1947. The hon. Member probably does not know that to-day the cost of a bus amounts to Rs. 26,000 or Rs. 27,000, whereas in 1947, it was only Rs. 7,000 to Rs. 8,000. This is only to give one instance of the difference in cost between 1947 and now. The cost of spares has also increased equally—about two and a half times what it was before. Considering all these things and considering also what to-day the economic condition of the country is, it is out of place here to take the figures that were available to us in 1947 and which held good in

9th December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

1947 when entirely different conditions prevailed in the country. Apart from this, Sir, the Hon. Minister who piloted this Bill has not cared to place before the House facts and figures. It is not correct on our part to go on certain assumptions that, after all, most of these operators are paying income-tax, and that, therefore, they ought to be in a position to pay this tax also. That is not the way in which the Bill ought to be piloted. The House has got to be told of the facts and figures. After all it is not a very difficult matter for the Hon. Minister to find out the figures and place them on the table of the House. He himself must have looked into those figures and balance sheets. If he has looked into those balance sheets and accounts, and if he is satisfied as to their correctness, what prevents him from placing those accounts and balance sheets before this House in cold print? He could have told us, 'look here; here are the figures in cold print; these people are in a position to pay the tax.' By placing the figures on the table of the House, he could have proved that my apprehensions were unfounded. The Hon. Minister claims to have looked into those figures. In spite of it, he did not agree to place those figures before the House. I think it is true that he himself is not satisfied that the bus operators are making huge profits. That is why he made an appeal to their philanthropic sense and not to their capacity to pay. I do not want to take much more of the time of the House. I believe that this Bill ought to be opposed. I would, therefore, request the Government even now to withdraw the Bill. Otherwise, we will have to oppose it."

6-20
P.m.

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Opposition has continued in the same spirit in which it began when I did the *aropanam* that was referred to. (Sri P. Ramamurthi: 'What is that *aropanam*?') They charged me with protecting profiteers. To me it was a very great pleasure to see the hon. Member Sri Anthoni Pillai make the same charge against them (the Communists). At the same time, as the hon. Member Sri Anthoni Pillai has come back to his seat, I take the occasion and I shall proceed to say a few words. He made a few offers, so to say, or challenges whatever they may be called. He said that he did not want to oppose the Bill as such from the point of view of the bus operators that they could not bear this burden. But he was doubtful about giving his support to the Bill on the ground of the apprehension that the burden on the passengers might be raised. Now, I want him to consider this. He referred to a certain clause in the Bill, which reiterates that the 7-pie maximum remains. He asked a question, 'Why this redundancy? Is it to remind the bus operators that they can raise the fares where lesser fares are now being charged?' Sir, there is no need to remind the operators. The hon. Member Sri Anthoni Pillai will grant me that the bus operators are fairly clever and that they know their law. They not only know their law but they know their lawyers also. (Laughter.) Therefore, they have not the least difficulty about understanding their rights. In fact, we have been hard hit by the High Court in some cases at the instance of these operators. The operators are quite capable of

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [9th December 1952]

taking care of themselves. There is no need to remind the bus operators about the law. What, then, is the reason for the clause? We have put in this clause because it was felt necessary to remove a possible apprehension. The bus operators represented to us, 'Are you also going to raise the maximum fare?' It may be it is redundant in one sense, but it is necessary in the other sense. It is done not with any idea of reminding them or suggesting to them that they could raise the passenger fares. I shall demonstrate it at once from the point of view of a Government which is anxious to get revenue. If even before the passing of this Bill, the operators had the legal right to raise the rates in those cases, what prevented them from doing it? Not failure to know the law but an economic position in which they thought their income would fall if they raised the rates. They feared diminishing returns if they raised the rates. That does not fail to operate even now. It still continues to operate and if they raise the rates, they will lose their income. What will be the further consequence to us? Some of the leaders on the other side pointed out that this Bill was a foolish measure, that the operators would go out of the field, and that income would fall rather than go up. If that is the result, the regressive effect on the profits of the bus owners will also be reflected in the revenues of the Government. Further, every Budget proposal for taxation is not an eternal proposition. If the income goes down, and if we find that we have committed a mistake and that the revenues of the Government go down, then we are bound to bring in a measure to correct the position. So, let nobody imagine that because we have introduced this Bill, we are for all time committed to this tax, even if we lose our revenue everyday. Therefore, on this question, the Government would be prepared to reconsider the position and their attitude in the light of results noticed. The hon. Member Sri Anthoni Pillai put to the Government, 'If I am satisfied or if the Government assure me that this is only a temporary measure, I am prepared to reconsider my attitude.' I have said enough on this subject. No taxation measure can be deemed permanent, especially a measure of this kind.

"Then, the other proposition that he put to the Government was this: 'Will you nationalise bus transport?' He put it partly in criticism of the hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi and partly as a query to us. As he himself pointed out, we have taken over the bus transport in the City of Madras. It is not a small matter. It is a very big budget and we have gone through it. When he raised this point, I intervened by saying that the difficulty we had been feeling was about our capacity to manage affairs like that. A mere general claim to efficiency on the part of the Government, even if we were not humble enough not to claim such a thing, is not relevant for the purpose of managing specialised business like transport. We could do something with it in Madras City. If, however, we feel at any time that we can manage such things at least in some places or in many places or in all places, we shall not hesitate to do it. But two things are necessary for it. This Assembly should vote the necessary funds for

9th December 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

buying it over and it should vote the necessary funds for running it and it should give us their moral support to run it. If these things are available, I here and now say that we are not only not opposed to nationalisation but we are rather inclined to it. It is our apprehension about our own capacity to manage and finance it that keeps us away from it. To-day we have to finance not one thing or another. We have to finance the people's food; we have to buy, we have to stock and we have to look after all these things. We have many commitments and that is why we hesitate. Therefore, on the point of nationalisation also, let me tell the hon. Member Sri Anthoni Pillai that we do not swear by non-nationalisation or anything of that kind. But we are quite willing and if the Assembly will help us and will approve of it and if the general wisdom of the House is in favour of it, we shall certainly do it.

"I shall not deal with any other matter."

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—"Sir, as I was listening to the speeches of Opposition Members to-day, I was reminded of an old saying 'Adversity makes strange bedfellows.' I was wondering if it was only adversity or if I should add two other words 'disappointment and frustration.' As I was listening to the speeches of the hon. Members Messrs. Govindasami Nayagar, Jeevanandam, Ramesam, Viswanatham and Ramamurthi, one after another attacking this Bill, I was wondering what really was behind this opposition. Was it with the desire to help the poor bus owner that this Bill was attacked? The bus-owner, according to the hon. Member Sri Vinayakam himself, goes about in flashy cars with tons of money behind him. Or, is there anything else behind this opposition? As the Hon. the Chief Minister put it yesterday, is it not really the desire to oppose the Government and not to help the poor bus-owners? This was really passing through my mind. But I shall not make a comment on that. If I take their word, the hon. Gentleman Sri Ramamurthi made it plain yesterday that he opposed the Bill on merits. I accept it. But I must protest against one statement which the hon. Gentleman Sri Govindasami Nayagar made. He insinuated and made charges against the bus-owners on the Congress side, who, he said, came into this House with a desire to get a few permits and now find themselves in a fix with the Damocles' sword over their heads. He narrated a story of how they came to him in their private capacity and begged of him and requested him to speak in support of them as they felt that they themselves could not oppose the measure brought forward by the Government. I do not think there could be a baser insinuation than that. I can tell him that bus-owners on our side did protest vehemently at every stage and they are now convinced that whatever may be their difficulties, they must come to the help of the nation at a time of need. The bus-owners on our side were consistent. They said, 'While there is famine raging everywhere, while more tanks should be repaired, and while more

[Dr. U. Krishna Rao] [9th December 1952]

relief should be given to the poor, we realize our duty and we must come to the help of the Government and we must increase taxation.'

6-30
p.m.

'There are two sets of citizens. I would like this House to tell me which of them is better. One set of citizens is consistent and says, 'Well, there is famine, there is all-round difficulty and all that; we agree; so while asking for more money to be spent on real nation-building activities, we must also support the Government and provide it with sufficient money.' That is one set. There is another set of citizens. They, right through the 365 days in a year, accuse this Government of going slow with their projects and of not digging enough wells, of not providing enough money for the famine-stricken and cyclone-affected victims. But when we bring forward certain measures for getting more money to help the poor people, they oppose those measures and say, 'Well, you cannot get the money from the people. How exactly you will carry on the administration is your own concern.' This is the other set. I would like to ask which of these two sets of citizens are more patriotic. Certainly, I would say that the bus-owners on this side of the House, who belong to the former category and who have the welfare of the country at heart, are the real patriotic citizens and I take my hat off to them. (Cheers.)

'The hon. Member Sri Rangaswami Reddiar of Tiruchirappalli had two ideas. He was not sure how he should vote. His first idea was that the bus industry was a profitable concern and so it can stand the taxation. Well, I think first ideas are always the best. (Cheers.) His natural conviction gave the real answer. But people around him tried to pull him up and impose their own conscience on him. That is why he has come to the unwarranted conclusion that this taxation was wrong.

'As I was just listening to hon. Member Sri Ramesam, I wished Sri Thimma Reddi were here. I suppose Sri Ramesam belongs to the same party as Sri Thimma Reddi. On the last occasion, Sri Thimma Reddi made a very strong accusation against the bus-owners and said they were minting money like anything. He said so many other things against the bus-owners. Well, I am surprised at the remarks made by Sri Ramesam who also belongs to Sri Thimma Reddi's party. Sri Ramesam observed that he did not believe the bus-operators were making money. At the same time he wanted that more bus routes should be given. If the hon. Gentleman sincerely feels that they are not at all making profit at the present time and if he is shedding real tears for them, then he should say, 'Please do not give more bus routes.' On the contrary, he has pleaded for the grant of bus routes to everybody. If his proposition is accepted, then the existing bus operators will get very much less than what they are getting at present. Because there will be many more competitors in the line and an operator who is getting a profit of Rs. 5 will get much less and may even incur a loss. So, that will be the position. I know Sri Ramesam,

9th December 1952] [Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

in his heart of hearts, is willing to support this measure, but at the same time is unwilling to do that openly and wound the feelings of some.

“ As I was listening to hon. Member Dr. K. B. Menon, I was not sure whether ultimately he will support us or not. Regarding his remark about overloading, I may tell him that the Government are aware of it. We have a flying squad to detect cases of overloading. We are trying our best to check this. In this matter, I request the public and the legislators to co-operate with us and bring to our notice all cases of overloading. We want them to support us and give us evidence whenever cases of overloading are detected. I request them not to refuse to co-operate with us in the matter. If there is evasion of payment of taxes, if there is any taxi which is running unauthorisedly not having paid the full amount of taxes and if there is intentional overloading, let the hon. Members bring them to our notice, and I welcome their co-operation and assistance in this matter. If they only do so, here and now I give the assurance that the Government will take suitable action against the offender, to whichever side he may belong. (Cheers.)

“ With regard to the tickets, we are making sincere attempts to see that tickets are not mis-printed. Very soon a method will be evolved by means of which we shall see that it is made fool-proof. Hon. Member Dr. K. B. Menon welcomed our assurance that the working of the measure will be carefully watched. The Hon. Chief Minister has already given an assurance that no measure of taxation is final and that every measure will have to be considered at the time of the Budget or whenever difficulties arise. I think that assurance is quite enough to convince the hon. Members that the whole thing will be reviewed.

“ Finally, with regard to the observations made by the hon. Gentleman Sri Ramamurthi, I wish to say a few words. He wished I had given a balance sheet. I know these balance sheets and how much the hon. Gentleman will believe them. Times without number I have heard the remark that the balance sheets were wrong and all that. So even if I had given a balance sheet I don't know how far Sri Ramamurthi will believe it now. The trouble about these balance sheets is this.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ I think the Hon. Minister knows that I can point out certain mistakes. I know how to read balance sheets, how to read in between the lines and find out how far they are true, where they are true and where exactly they are not true.”

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Balance sheets should be believed and at any rate audited balance sheets should be believed. That is my view always. But it is not always accepted. For, people tell me that there are various methods of preparing these balance sheets. They say that the depreciation

[Dr. U. Krishna Rao] [9th December 1952]

percentage and the wear and tear percentage are not final and generally they won't be accepted by all to be correct or reasonable. Anyway, I am not the competent authority to discuss all those things here. It is enough if I say that I am prepared to believe balance sheets and especially audited balance sheets. Well I am glad that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has given the assurance that he believes the balance sheets and I hope he will have no occasion to differ from it. All these things considered, however harsh my friends have been, I know in their heart of hearts they want to support this measure. But externally, due to party influence and party affiliations and due to the desire that this Congress Government should be opposed at all costs they perhaps want to oppose this measure also. I am prepared to excuse them. But I may, however, tell them that when this Bill comes into force actually, they will see our sincerity of purpose. They will also understand that we have brought forward this measure only to balance the Budget. Let them take my assurance that if in the actual working of the provisions of the Bill, we find any causes for change, we will certainly come before the House. I once again thank all the hon. Members of the House, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, the Leaders of other parties and also you, Mr. Speaker, for giving me the privilege of moving this Bill."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" On a point of personal explanation, Sir . . . "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" It has become a very bad habit with Mr. Viswanatham to have the last word always." (Laughter.)

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I think the Hon. Chief Minister meant to say that it is a very good habit. (Laughter.) Referring to me and to others who joined in the opposition to this Bill, the Hon. Industries Minister said that adversity made strange bedfellows. May I tell him that prosperity makes stranger bedfellows on the other side? "

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" My point of personal explanation is this. The Hon. Minister for Industries was referring to some of the honest and patriotic bus-owners on his side. I admit they are now patriotic and also honest to the Government. After all, the Government want money. Sir, at the same time I want to point out that the bus-operators were not honest to us. They were playing the cat's-paw game and just like the monkey, they wanted us to pick up the chestnut from the fire for them. I want to make this point clear."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' That the Madras Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952, be passed into law.' "

The motion was declared carried.

9th December 1952]

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus :

Ayes.

The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.
" A. B. Shetty.
" M. A. Manickavelu Naicker.
" Dr. U. Krishna Rao.

Sri K. Rajaram.
" C. Rajam Ramaswami.
" P. G. Karuthiruman.
" B. K. Nallasamy.
" S. C. Virupakshiah.
" P. S. Nalla Gounder.
" P. G. Manickam.
" N. Mahalingam.
" R. Kuppuswami.
" V. K. Palaniswami Gounder.
" N. Mounaguruswami Naidu.
" A. K. Subbaraya Gounder.
" P. S. Rangaswamy Naidu.
" S. R. Arumugham.
" K. H. Bomman.
" M. K. Kempai Gounder.
" T. M. Kaliannan.
" M. P. Periaswami.
" K. S. Ardhanareswara Gounder.
" A. Sambasivam.
" C. Lakshmana Kandar.
Dr. P. Varadarajulu Naidu.

The Hon. Sri K. P. Kuttikrishnan Nayar.
" Dr. R. Nagan Gouda.

Sri N. Ramakrishna Ayyar.
" T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi.
" K. Koti Reddi.
" A. M. Sambandam.
" M. R. Ramachandran.
" O. Venkatasubba Reddi.
" B. Parameswaran.
" T. P. Elumalai.
" S. Panchaksharam.
" A. K. Masilamani Chettiar.
" H. M. Jagannatham.
" A. Ramachandra Reddiar.
" R. Thangavelu.
" L. Anandan.
" V. Krishnaswami Padayachi.
" G. Vagheesam Pillay.
" A. S. Sahajanandam.
" O. A. Nanjappa.
" P. M. Munuswamy Gounder.
" K. S. Subramania Gounder.
" A. M. Ratnaswami.
" M. Marimuthu.

Janab Mohamed Salih Maraikayar.

The Hon. Sri V. C. Palaniswami Gounder.

" K. Venkataswami Naidu.
" N. Sankara Reddi.
" D. Sanjivayya.
" S. B. P. Pattabhi Rama Rao.

Srimathi Dr. T. S. Soundaram Ramachandran.

" T. Kotamma Reddi.

Sri M. S. Muniswamy Pillay.
" C. Chinnaswami Naidu.
" S. Chinna Karuppa Thevar.

Sri V. S. Sivaprakasam.

" V. Muthu.
" A. S. Subbaraj.
" Thinakaranaswami Thevar.
" R. Krishnaswami Naidu.
" S. Jayarama Reddiar.
" Vaikuntam.
" G. Govindan.
" P. S. Krishnaswamy Ayyangar.
" S. Ramaswamy Naidu.
" Ar. A. Rm. Chokkalingam Chettiar.
" P. Chellathurai.
" N. Rajagopal.
" R. M. Palaniappan.
" T. K. Rama.
" T. V. Sannasi.
" Anthony Peter.
" T. R. Varadan.
" S. Venkatarama Ayyar.
" C. Muthiah Pillai.
" R. V. Swaminathan.
" S. Chellapandian.
" K. T. Kosalam.
" P. Urkavalan.
" R. S. K. Pandiyan.
" M. G. Shanker.
" S. Somayajulu.
" Chinnathambi Thever.
" P. Selvaraj.
" V. Arumugham.
" K. Ramasamy Doss.
" R. S. Arumugam.
" A. Venkatramiah.
" A. Rami Reddi.
" N. Chenchurama Naidu.
" P. Gopalakrishna Reddi.
" K. Shanmugam.
" P. Venkataswamy Reddi.
" Muthukumarasamy.
" G. Narayanaswamy Naidu.

Raja Sri V. V. Krishnam Raju Bahadur

Sri Thota Ramasamy.

" P. Satyanarayana Reddi.

Raja M. A. Muthiah Chettiar.

Sri P. Gunnaayya.

" L. Lakshmana Das.
" K. Suryanarayana.
" H. Satyanarayana Dora.
" P. Sangam Naidu.
" T. C. Atchannaidu.
" P. Venkatasubbayya.
" K. V. Vema Reddi.
" S. Narayanappa.
" K. Santhappa.
" N. Gopala Menon.
" A. Appu.
" V. C. Chudaman Deo.
" M. Rajeswara Rao.
" B. Krishnamoorthy Row.
" A. Balarama Reddi.
" D. Ramabrahmam.
" K. Adikesavalu Naidu.
" M. Doraikannu.
" H. Ramalinga Reddi.
" G. Nagabhushanam.

[9th December 1952]

Ayes—cont.

Sri Ijari Sirasappa.
 „ Kotra Basavana Goud.
 „ S. Parameswarappa.
 „ V. Chinnayya.
 „ T. Mallayya.
 „ T. Anantha Pai.
 „ Y. Manjaya Shetty.
 „ K. Venkataramana Gowda.
 „ K. Ishwara.
 „ E. K. Sankara Varma Raja.
 Janab M. S. Mogral.
 Sri M. Jagannathan.

Sri L. C. Pais.
 „ W. J. Fernandez.
 „ M. Venkatasubba Reddi.
 „ S. C. C. Anthony Pillai.
 „ Padmaprabha Gounder.
 Janab K. Moidoo.
 „ K. Uppi.
 „ Kunhi Mohamed Shaffee.
 „ K. M. Seethi.
 Sri G. Samia Koorayar.
 „ K. Venkata Setty.

Noes.

Sri M. Muni Reddi.
 „ B. Gangayya Naidu.
 „ P. Pundarikakshacharyulu.
 „ K. Narayana.
 „ M. Srungaram.
 „ M. Gangappa.
 „ M. Pentannaidu.
 „ K. Venkatakurmi Naidu.
 „ H. B. Ari Gowder.
 „ K. T. Raju.
 „ K. P. Gopalan.
 „ C. Kaudaswami.
 „ V. Madanagopal.
 „ S. Ramalingam.
 „ N. Sivaraj.
 „ K. V. Ramaswamy.
 „ T. S. Ardhanari.
 „ P. Venkatesha Sholagar.
 „ P. Narasimha Reddi.
 „ N. Sivarami Reddi.
 „ D. Seetharamiah.
 „ C. H. Kanaran.
 „ K. Madhavan Nambiar.
 „ R. Krishnan.
 „ E. T. Kunhan.
 „ M. Hanumantha Rao.
 „ K. Rajagopala Rao.
 „ P. Venkatasiviah.
 „ P. Rama Rao.
 „ V. Rama Rao.
 „ T. Potha Raju.
 „ P. S. Ramachandra Rao.
 „ K. Malakondayya.
 „ M. Narayanaswamy.
 „ K. Venkalah.
 „ P. Syamasundara Rao.
 „ B. Lakshminarasa Raju.
 „ G. Satyanarayana.
 „ G. Anjaneyulu.
 „ V. Sri Krishna.
 „ G. Joseph.
 „ D. Lakshmayya.
 „ M. Kune Rao.
 „ G. Nageshwara Rao.
 „ Alluri Venkataramaraju.
 „ R. Venkata Jagga Rao.
 „ K. Ranga Rao.
 „ K. Subba Reddi.
 „ Chandra Ramalingayya.
 „ C. Prabhakara Choudary.
 „ G. Rama Rao.
 „ K. Govinda Rao.
 „ M. Veerabhadran.

Sri K. Vinayakam.
 „ S. Swayamprakasam.
 „ V. V. Ramasami.
 „ S. S. Ramasami Padayachi.
 „ P. Rathnaswami Pillay.
 „ A. Senapathi Gounder.
 „ E. L. Raghava Mudaliar.
 „ M. Palaniandi.
 „ K. Krishna Rao.
 „ P. Rangasamy Reddiar.
 „ T. Shanmugham.
 „ T. Lakshminarayana Reddi.
 „ P. Kandaswamy Gounder.
 „ G. C. Kondayya.
 „ M. Manicka Sundaram.
 „ P. R. Rajagopala Gounder.
 „ K. R. Sambandam.
 „ S. Kasi Reddy.
 „ P. Chokkalingam.
 „ V. Saka Venkata Rao.
 „ B. Sankarayya.
 „ T. Nagi Reddi.
 „ Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu.
 „ S. Deivasigamony.
 „ Bojja Appalasamy.
 „ S. Vemiah.
 „ K. Gajapathi Reddi.
 „ M. Lakshmanaswamy.
 „ K. Ramiah Chowdry.
 „ Y. V. Krishna Rao.
 „ B. Ramakrishna Reddi.
 „ C. Pulla Reddi.
 „ G. Bapanayya.
 „ T. Viswanatham.
 „ P. Ramamurthy.
 „ T. C. Narayana Nambiar.
 „ K. R. Viswanathan.
 „ N. Paramasivam.
 „ V. Gopala Gounder.
 „ A. Govindasamy Nayakar.
 „ K. Aranganathan.
 „ A. Ayyaru.
 „ G. Yallamanda Reddi.
 „ S. Kandaswamy Gounder.
 „ M. Venugopala Gounder.
 „ M. Kattimuthu.
 „ S. Radhakrishnan.
 „ K. T. Sridharan.
 „ M. Narayana Kurup.
 „ O. Koran.
 „ P. K. Gopalakrishnan.
 „ K. C. Gopalan Unni.

9th December 1952]

Neutral.

Sri K. V. S. Padmanabha Raju,

Ayes : 149. Noes : 105. Neutral : 1.

The motion was carried and the Bill was passed into law.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The House will now adjourn and meet again at 9 a.m. tomorrow.”

The House then adjourned.

V.—PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

G.O. No. 1800, L.A., dated 8th September 1952, regarding inclusion of certain parts within the limits of Coimbatore District Board.

